

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A529

For Bombing Resumption the Need Was Obvious**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. RICHARD FULTON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the recent resumption of bombing of North Vietnamese personnel and installations came after a concerted effort over many weeks by President Johnson to seek a means whereby this tragic conflict could be removed from the fields of battle and be pursued at the conference table in the hopes of a peaceful settlement.

It was with great regret that President Johnson ordered the resumption of the bombings. Nonetheless the decision was his to make and it was made, doubtlessly with reluctance and heavy heart.

Mr. Speaker, the President's decision has drawn significant approval. Among those who have joined in approval is the Nashville Banner. The views of this paper were published in an editorial dated February 1, 1966, and entitled "Right, Mr. President: For Bombing Resumption, the Need Was Obvious."

I would like to insert this editorial in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

RIGHT, MR. PRESIDENT—FOR BOMBING RESUMPTION, THE NEED WAS OBVIOUS

It was not an impromptu decision, contrived in the dark and spurred by impulse, that sent U.S. bombers back into action over North Vietnam yesterday—ending in its 38th day the bombing suspension that began on Christmas eve. It was a military necessity; the logical and only effective answer to that enemy's contemptuous disregard of America's sustained effort for peaceful settlement at a conference table.

President Johnson spelled it out clearly in his calm message of formal announcement and reasoned explanation. He assuredly has the majority of America with him in that decision; for to the bulk of this constituency it was—and is—obvious that the avenue to peace does not lie in the direction of overtures to Hanoi. These have failed; construed by that enemy as a sign of weakness and indecision.

It now is clear that the Vietcong wants no peace, save on its own terms, amounting to total conquest. That would be U.S. surrender—a repudiation of its commitments, and the turning over, ultimately, of all Asia to Communist aggression.

There was no timidity and indecision in the President's statement. He laid it on the line, exercising again a prerogative given in the congressional resolution of August

1964—and with the action recommended by competent advisers including, notably, the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

With that decision there can be no quarrel on the part of any security-minded American, sensitive to the facts in the case as restated. One paragraph stands out by way of solemn warning:

"If continued immunity is given to all that supports North Vietnam aggression, the cost in lives—Vietnamese lives and American lives and allied lives—will be greatly increased."

That has been true throughout the one-sided 37-day cease-fire; it would be equally true of any settlement that installed a Vietcong Government over that land, to break out afresh across Asia when it had consolidated its strength with that of its Communist partners to push for wider conquest.

The Banner opposed that U.S. commitment from the outset—objecting to an adventure obviously not thought through at the time. But once involved in it, and engaged in the war that followed, this newspaper has emphasized that we must win it. Nothing less than victory will justify the sacrifice that already has been made.

President Johnson was not repudiating the concept of honorable peace—arrived at by any avenue of reason. He went to great length to assure contemporary powers of America's willingness to present the Vietnamese issue to world judgment. He authorized Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to submit it to a review by the U.N. Security Council. He gave respectful acknowledgment to Pope Paul's urgent suggestion for arbitration by neutral powers. As reiterated in the course of his text, top U.S. diplomats have made the rounds of the world in these Christmas and post-Christmas weeks, expressing America's willingness to negotiate.

America wants an honorable peace, with guarantees of freedom as the only objective that can make it that. That is the U.S. purpose; it wants not a square inch of real estate, or captive status for any people on earth.

The whole world knows that, and charges to the contrary are infamous.

The United States suspended those bombings in the hope that—sparing North Vietnam the punishment that was occurring—the enemy would come to the conference table. The hope was in vain.

That is why the bombings have resumed—a foretaste of the power this Nation has to crush that enemy on whom peace overtures have been wasted.

The President has made his decision, and it was the right one. He presented the case with courage and candor; with due respect for the opinions of mankind, but with a primary concern where it belongs, on the interest of the United States. With any failure to meet this challenge, that very default would compound the ultimate sacrifice.

America has the resources to win this war, and must use them to that end.

It is a time-honored maxim, now understood surely by thinking men everywhere, that once you are engaged in war there is no substitute for victory.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A527

Army Doctors in Hawaii Make Notable Advance in Malaria Fight**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker there are few news stories that can surpass the excitement evoked by reading an article on a breakthrough in the treatment of a disease. Such a breakthrough was reported in the treatment of the dreaded malaria on Tuesday, January 18, 1966. The news is especially timely since an estimated 1 out of 3 GI's in Vietnam has been contracting this dreaded disease. There is no question about the morale boosting effect the news of this breakthrough has had on our troops in Vietnam.

The heroes who discovered the combination of drugs that could break the relapse cycle of the recurring type of malaria are Col. Frank L. Miller and Col. James A. Orbison, medical officers who are assigned to U.S. Army, Tripler General Hospital in Hawaii. They have by their tireless efforts to discover this "wonder mix," proven again that the war can be fought just as heroically in the laboratories on the homefront as in the swamps of Vietnam.

I commend to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article written by Lyle Nelson on the breakthrough in the treatment of malaria which appeared in the Thursday, January 20, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

TWO AT TRIPLEX HAILED FOR BREAKTHROUGH IN MALARIA FIGHT

(By Lyle Nelson)

Back in the days of World War II, GI's took so many atabrin pills to avoid malaria they turned yellow.

And if they threw the pills away they often came down with malaria, which causes chills, a fever, a headache, and a rotten feeling in general.

Then came the Vietnam war and a tougher strain of malaria popped up. It resisted the medicine that seemed to work at Guadalcanal and other tropical battlegrounds.

Now this type of malaria appears to be licked, thanks to the men at Tripler Hospital.

Finding a cure for anything in the field of medicine is part luck and part attention to the smallest detail in analyzing research and laboratory data.

CREDIT TWO COLONELS

Special credit at Tripler for finding a possible way to solve the malaria problem in Vietnam goes to Col. Frank L. Miller, chief of pulmonary and infectious diseases, and the man he works for and with, Col. James A. Orbison, chief of the department of medicine at Tripler.

Malaria has become a big problem in Vietnam. In some areas 1 out of 3 GI's got the bug.

Tripler took in 285 victims last year.

Miller started watching how often they suffered relapses and what drugs or combination of drugs they were taking, in Vietnam and after they arrived at Tripler.

He discovered that malaria attacks reoccurred among men who had taken different combinations of drugs with one exception.

WONDER MIX

The wonder mix appeared to be pyrimethamine (a sulfone) and quinine.

Miller and Orbison found they could break this relapse cycle with this combination.

Hints of this finding came from similar malaria research being conducted among volunteer prisoners at the Illinois State Prison in Joliet.

The word on pyrimethamine and quinine is now being passed along to hospitals between Washington and Saigon.

Army officials in the Pentagon discussed the breakthrough Tuesday.

Miller and Orbison will discuss the matter before Honolulu's civilian doctors at the regular meeting of the American College of Physicians at the Mabel L. Smyth Auditorium February 23.

THE CAUSE

Malaria is caused by a parasite which works its way into the red blood cells after a victim is bitten by a mosquito bearing the disease.

Victims are treated in two ways.

First, doctors administer drugs that will help prevent malaria "bugs" from growing and developing.

In cases, like those at Tripler, where it is too late to do this, they try to break the relapse cycle.

It is in this cycle, between the active and dormant stages, that they achieved what appears to be a cure.

Not only will the finding be good news for servicemen in tropical areas but for discharged Vietnam veterans who are having relapses of malaria.

One such case in Colorado recently proved fatal. He apparently was no longer taking pills.

It's almost a case of better yellow than dead.

Challenge to the U.N.**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun Times carried an excellent editorial in its February 2 edition dealing with our efforts to bring the whole Vietnam issue before the United Nations. I fully agree with the Sun Times editorial that the United States has handed the United Nations a problem that will be harder to solve than any that body has undertaken in the past. But I also agree that if the U.N. can indeed resolve the Vietnam conflict, it will attain a new scope of respect and dignity not only in the United States but throughout the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, the Sun Times editorial follows:

CHALLENGE TO THE U.N.

The U.S. resolution to the U.N. Security Council on Vietnam was brief and to the point. It recommended that "appropriate interested governments" arrange a conference "looking toward the application of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia." The first order of business of the conference would be to arrange an end to the fighting in Vietnam.

If the Security Council does take on the task its members will undoubtedly discover—and hopefully appreciate—some of the dif-

iculties the United States has struggled with in its efforts to stop Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

It is doubtful that the U.N. Security Council can come to any solution of the Vietnam conflict without consultation with either Red China or North Vietnam or both. The wording of the U.S. resolution is such that room has been left for the Security Council to invite these nations to the conference. Whether they would accept such an invitation is another matter. Hanoi has refused, in the past, to accept a similar invitation made by the U.N. on the grounds that it did not recognize that international body.

The United States has handed the U.N. a problem that will be harder to solve than any that body has undertaken in the past. If the U.N. does make the effort to solve the crisis in Vietnam and it is rebuffed by the aggressor nations it then faces an even greater problem—a direct and open challenge to every member U.N. nation of the right of the nations of the world to live in peace.

*LN***Roscoe Drummond Defends U.S. Decision on Bombing****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. ED EDMONDSON**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are conclusive reasons why the bombing pause in North Vietnam could not be continued indefinitely without some constructive response from Hanoi.

In pinpointing these reasons, no one, it seems to me, has done a better job than Columnist Roscoe Drummond.

In a February 2 column in the Washington Post, entitled "The Lull Ends—The United States Shows Its Mettle," Mr. Drummond stated that the decision will effectively unify the country behind the President. "It was a painful decision," he wrote. One reason for its necessity, he said, was the fact that "Ho Chi Minh confirmed publicly that he would not negotiate until after unconditional surrender by South Vietnam and removal of all U.S. forces."

A second reason, he said, was because "North Vietnam used the bombing pause of 37 days to increase the flow of North Vietnamese troops across the border" into South Vietnam. "Obviously," Mr. Drummond adds, "the diplomatic reasons for continuing the pause were exhausted."

While believing that to resume the bombing was not a "welcome or agreeable choice," he stated that the alternative "of yielding South Vietnam and southeast Asia to the aggressor—would be far worse for the United States and the whole free world."

The column is one which many of my colleagues will want to ponder and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD: THE LULL ENDS—THE UNITED STATES SHOWS ITS METTE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The instant results of President Johnson's resumption of bombing North Vietnam—he-

cause Hanoi rejected all U.S. and all other efforts, to negotiate—will be these:

It will effectively unify the Congress behind whatever is needed to defend South Vietnam.

It will effectively unify the country behind the hard decisions the President will have to make in the near future.

It will mean that the United States will increase its military actions at every level in order to remove Hanoi's belief it can win because we will become hopelessly divided, grow weary, and don't really mean to stick it out.

It will leave open the door to peace talks anytime Hanoi so chooses—as the action in taking the issue to the U.N. Security Council shows.

There are conclusive reasons why the bombing pause could not be continued indefinitely without some constructive response from Hanoi. The decision was never in doubt. It was a painful decision but not a difficult one because it rested on two facts:

The fact that Ho Chi Minh confirmed publicly that he would not negotiate until after unconditional surrender by South Vietnam and removal of all U.S. forces.

The fact that North Vietnam used the bombing pause of 37 days to increase the flow of North Vietnamese troops across the border and to increase the level of Vietcong attacks and terror in South Vietnam to a point greater in number than ever.

Obviously, the diplomatic reasons for continuing the pause were exhausted.

There will of course be some dissident and fear-laden voices in Congress. A democracy is never unanimous. Only 3 months before Pearl Harbor, Congress came within one vote of killing the draft. But now the leading advocates of continuing the bombing pause—Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD and the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, WILLIAM FULBRIGHT—affirm their support of the President.

And how will the American people respond? Here, too, there will be honest differences which the Communists see, not as a source of a democracy's strength, but as a weakness on which they continue to count. But just before the President announced his decision, Louis Harris sampled public opinion and found that if Hanoi refused to talk peace, the American people would support the resumption of bombing by more than 2 to 1. His survey showed that 60 percent of the country would back a U.S. force of 500,000 troops in South Vietnam.

To have to resume the bombing is not a welcome nor agreeable choice. But the alternative—of yielding South Vietnam and southeast Asia to the aggressor—would be far worse for the United States and the whole free world.

Pittsburgh Youth Corps Fights Despair and Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of young people in my home city of Pittsburgh have found a bright new hope for their futures through their work since last August in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The attention and help given them

has paid off not only in turning them away from lives of bleak despair and crime and toward education and profitable endeavor, it has also provided services to the entire city and its population that would not otherwise have been available.

I fervently hope that this program can continue another year in Pittsburgh and in other cities where it is a similar proven success.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a progress report by Pittsburgh Mayor, Joseph M. Barr, at this point in the RECORD:

PITTSBURGH NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRESS REPORT

(By Mayor Joseph M. Barr)

Since its inception August 16, 1965, the Neighborhood Youth Corps has been a two-way boon to Pittsburgh. Youngsters, who otherwise may not have been employed, have benefited from new-found work experience and on-the-job training. At the same time, the city and its residents have benefited from new projects and increased services which could not have been done without Youth Corps personnel.

The success of the program is pointed up by the many requests from city departments and Federal agencies for additional Youth Corps workers.

In reporting on the Youth Corps, I would be remiss if I did not commend the program coordinator, Mrs. Marion Finkelhor. The program's success is largely a result of her ability to work with young people and to understand their problems. Under her skillful direction, the City's Youth Corps has gained recognition as one of the best in the Nation.

Youngsters enrolling in the Youth Corps have received the following services:

1. Intensive job and personal counselling.
2. Comprehensive medical examinations by the Allegheny County Health Department.
3. Aptitude testing by the Bureau of Employment Security.
4. Work-training courses in various city departments.

5. Special services by the Bureau of Rehabilitation and medical clinics.

6. Job placement services by the Bureau of Employment Security.

7. Educational assistance through programs by the Pittsburgh Board of Education.

Through the counseling service, youngsters who have not finished high school are encouraged to return to school in the evening and earn their diploma.

We are particularly heartened by the results of this counseling effort so far. Of the 639 youngsters working with the city, more than 125 of them have been persuaded to return to night school to expand their education. This is an encouraging example of what can happen when youngsters receive some attention and help.

Youth Corps workers have also benefited from our initial medical examinations, which disclosed previously undetected medical problems among one-half of the youngsters. The Allegheny County Health Department referred these people to neighborhood clinics for treatment.

Most importantly, the Youth Corps has brought new hope and new opportunity to youngsters whose prospects, until now, were dimmed by economic, social and educational disadvantages.

They are doing useful work that otherwise would not be done and at the same time gaining the experience and dignity of working for a living. For most of them, this is their first job, their first paycheck, and the first time that anyone has paid attention to them and tried to help them.

I want to make it clear that our Youth Corps program was not started to provide permanent employment for any youngster. On the contrary, these youngsters must register with the Bureau of Employment Security for placement in regular jobs in private industry or for placement in manpower re-training programs.

In the meantime, however, Youth Corps boys and girls are carrying out a wide variety of meaningful projects for the city. These projects include the following:

1. Youth Corps boys, working under supervision of the department of lands and buildings, have cleared refuse from more than 30 lots in the Hill District. Their work has enabled the city to earmark some of these lots for eventual improvement as small neighborhood parklets.

2. Youngsters assigned to the department of public works have cleared old growth from hillsides throughout the city, and have cleaned bridge foundations, rain gutters and catch basins wherever this work was needed. A total of 28 boys have worked on the city's asphalt repaving program. All in all, Youth Corps boys have made minor improvements to more than 500 city streets.

3. During the winter months, Youth Corps boys will be at work cleaning the interiors of all city buildings. Some boys will also assist in minor but necessary snow removal work, particularly on bridges and crosswalks.

4. About 60 youngsters are working as aids in recreation centers throughout the city. Boys working with the bureau of parks have undertaken an extensive park-improvement program, including the clearing of walks and trails, a tree maintenance program, and the cleaning of park buildings. Other boys are assigned to duties in the zoo, the Aviary, and Phipps Conservatory.

5. Youngsters assigned to the bureau of traffic planning have been responsible for the painting of more than 200 crosswalks, a 20-percent increase in sign installations, and greater efficiency in the repair of parking meters. Other Youth Corps projects in this bureau have included 71 traffic counts, 56 pedestrian counts, and an intensive traffic study of the Brookline area.

6. Eight youngsters are working on highly skilled jobs in the department of city planning. One boy of potential college caliber has worked closely with the department's architect on drafting and planning.

7. Youngsters with clerical skills are working in various city offices and have helped reduce or eliminate filing backlogs, thereby enabling these offices to operate with greater efficiency.

8. Since the contract with the Federal Government permits assignment of Youth Corps youngsters to Federal offices, about 20 young people are now working with the Bureau of Internal Revenue to help process the seasonal load of income tax returns.

9. Arrangements have been made with the Leech Farm Veterans Hospital for an intensive work-training program for potential hospital personnel. This program will provide opportunities for girls who do not have the necessary skills for clerical work.

To sum up, the city's Neighborhood Youth Corps program has provided hundreds of young adults, whose futures seemed blighted and bleak, with new hope for a chance to hold a job and to further their education.

By taking these youngsters off the streets, we are also reducing the likelihood of their lapsing into the delinquency that idleness can bring.

We are encouraged by the response of these youngsters to the program, and by the tangible results of their work.

I, for one, am convinced that the Neighborhood Youth Corps has proven itself to be a vital link in Pittsburgh's antipoverty effort.

February

A526

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

he said, and the number will be increased now by those examined by Federal officials. But there appears to be no basic conflict between the two offices over who qualifies to vote and who doesn't.—James E. Jacobson.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to our colleagues JIM MARTIN, and JOHN BUCHANAN, of Alabama a reading of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and some of the testimony given at the hearings before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

**Birmingham Area Chamber of Commerce
Protests Attorney General's Decision**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 20, from the well of this House, I made a report on the excellent work of the Jefferson County Board of Registrars in attempting to facilitate the registration of all persons in Jefferson County who had a minimal interest in registering and voting.

On that same day we received word that Attorney General Katzenbach had decided to send Federal registrars into our county. Typical of the reaction of the leadership of our city to this regrettable decision is the letter from Mr. Walter Bouldin, president of the Birmingham Area Chamber of Commerce, and Mr. Crawford Johnson III, chairman of the board, written at the direction of the board of directors of this body.

As a member of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, I endorse this excellent statement and am confident that it expresses the feeling of the entire membership and the overwhelming majority of the citizens of Birmingham:

BIRMINGHAM AREA CHAMBER OF

COMMERCE, INC.

Birmingham, Ala., January 28, 1966.

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL KATZENBACH: As representatives of the major portion of the business and professional community of the Birmingham area, we have been instructed by our board of directors to convey to you our deeply felt protest against your action in sending Federal examiners to the Birmingham area under the Voting Rights Act.

Under that act, your action required you to find that you have received complaints you believed meritorious that persons had been denied the right to vote on account of their race or color, or to find the appointment of examiners otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment.

There is no merit in any complaint that persons are being denied the right to vote on account of their race or color in the Birmingham area, as the Jefferson County Board of Registrars had, long before the appointment of Federal examiners, been registering applicants, white and Negro, freely and promptly without impeding registration by any test or device. There has been, so far as we are able to ascertain, no substantial claim that any registrant was discriminated against in that process.

Your decision as to Federal examiners must, therefore, have been based upon a finding that the appointment of examiners was otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment. In making that finding, the act required that you consider what bona fide efforts were being made in the Birmingham area to comply with the 15th amendment. There can be no doubt that such bona fide efforts have been made.

The Jefferson County Board of Registrars has, since January 1 of this year, more than tripled the number of registration clerks, including the addition of Negro clerks. They have extended their registration days from 3 days per week to 5 days per week, one of which is all day Saturday. The capacity of the facilities of the board of registrars to register voters has been far greater than required by the number of applicants for registration. Even on the Saturday preceding your action, applicants for registration were fewer than could have been registered by the board. Those truly desirous of registering have had ample opportunity to do so.

We cannot escape the conclusion that the only basis for appointment of Federal examiners was to make registration more convenient. Considering the gravity of sending Federal examiners to take over a function of a State, a function which is guaranteed to that State by the Constitution of the United States; considering that this action, in addition to affecting the integrity of constitutional government with all the harmful consequences inherent in such an action, was an encouragement of demonstrations such as those which preceded your action, demonstrations which involved so many unlawful acts that injunctions against them have been issued by the Federal court of this district, the mere increase in the convenience of voter registration is, in our judgment, a basis so inadequate for your action as to justify our protest and to require your reconsideration.

Sincerely,

WALTER BOULDIN,
President.
CRAWFORD JOHNSON III.
Chairman of the Board.

Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, if there is one task which this session of the 89th Congress must undertake this year, it is the job of reappraising last year's work. It behoves each Member to deliberate carefully on the programs of the first session and to examine some of the inequities of its legislative products.

I have received a letter from Hal Chase, Jr., which documents very clearly many of these inequities. It compares the Government's traditional allowance of \$600 per child from total personal income to the Government's own costs of aiding people under the programs of the Great Society. Under unanimous consent, I include the letter in the Appendix of the RECORD.

HAL CHASE & SONS,

Batesland, S. Dak., November 11, 1965.

As you are one of our lawmakers and also a vital cog in our Government I would like

to ask you how much you figure to rear a child?

You allow us taxpaying parents one year to feed, clothe, house, and youngster.

Yet to feed, clothe, house, and train a youngster in your Federal Government you spend \$4,536 per year.

You allow taxpaying parents \$600 deduction for the care and feeding of each child. Yet under the Cuban refugee program, you assume minimal upkeep requires \$1,200 a year, and if the Cuban boy or girl is attending school, an extra \$1,000 a year. How come you shortchange us homefolks?

In the austere environs of a Federal prison, you have discovered that it costs—to maintain one person—with no frills, no luxuries, and no borrowing dad's car—\$2,300 per year.

Under social security, you will pay \$168 a month to maintain the elderly. What makes you think we can maintain our young'uns on \$50 a month?

And the VISTA program (Volunteers in Service to America) spent \$3.1 million this last fiscal year to turn out only 202 trainees. That indicates that the cost of maintaining and training one youth for 1 year is more than \$15,000.

Or how much do you spend upkeeping one youngster in military uniform? I'll tell you in case you don't have the figures handy, housing, \$55.20 a month; food, \$80.27 a month; clothing upkeep, \$4.20 a month, that comes to \$1,076.04 a year. How in the world do you expect parents to provide all these things, plus clothes, recreation, books, medicine, for \$600 a year? With the above figures you will have to admit the Government admits it can't be done.

Yours truly,

HAL CHASE, Jr.

Students Aid VC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports, certain individuals who call themselves the Medical Aid Committee for Vietnam have sent a check for \$500 to a representative of the Vietcong.

According to preliminary information I have received the law does not prohibit this action and if further research does not disclose any provision of statute under which such individuals can be prosecuted, it is my intention to introduce a bill to provide criminal penalties for such action.

Included at the conclusion of my remarks is a news item published in the Washington News on January 25, 1966:

STUDENTS AID VC

BERKELEY, CALIF., January 25.—The Medical Aid Committee for Vietnam announced yesterday it had sent a check for \$500 to a representative of the Vietcong in Prague, Czechoslovakia, "for medical supplies for the victims of U.S. aggression in Vietnam."

The committee stirred up a controversy on the University of California campus in November when it began soliciting blood donations for "all victims" of the Vietnam war.

When the International Red Cross said it could not deliver blood to North Vietnam, the organization raised medical funds.

93, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A525

traveled throughout the country for her poise and beauty but is an outstanding example of the in American youth.

It is my pleasure to offer a sincere welcome to such a fine young woman.

Representative Tenzer Rebuts "Dear Colleague" Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. HERBERT TENZER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague **JIM MARTIN**, of Alabama, circulated a "Dear Colleague" letter dated January 26, 1966, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1966, at page 993. In his letter he refers to the "bill of particulars" inserted in the RECORD of January 20, 1966, by another colleague, **JOHN BUCHANAN** of Alabama which appears beginning at page 811.

Mr. Speaker, to clarify the subject raised by our colleagues **JIM MARTIN**, and **JOHN BUCHANAN**, of Alabama, I call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appears in the Birmingham News of January 23, 1966 which follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Jan. 23, 1966]

REASON FOR FEDERALS: DIDN'T REGISTER ENOUGH VOTERS, KATZENBACH SAYS

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—Street demonstrations in Birmingham had no influence on the Justice Department decision to send Federal voting examiners to Birmingham and Jefferson County, according to the man who made that decision.

He is Nicholas Katzenbach, Attorney General of the United States.

"It ought to be plain from the record," Katzenbach said in an interview. "Neither the presence of the recent street demonstrations nor the absence of demonstrations earlier played any part in the decision. The issue was availability of the chance to register. There simply was not enough availability or access to the registrars—considering the large numbers of both Negroes and whites of voting age who are not registered voters."

Justice Department officials explained the lack of access this way. Jefferson County, they said, did little or nothing to expand registration opportunities for Negroes after the Voting Rights Act went into effect last August, when only 26,255 of the county's estimated 116,160 Negroes of voting age were registered voters.

Less than 4,000 Negroes were registered in December and the rate so far in January has been about 2,000 a week. More than 74,000 Negroes and over 100,000 whites of voting age are still unregistered in the county, the department estimated.

Only 10 more weeks of registration by local boards will be offered, since the lists close 2 weeks before the State Democratic primary on May 3. At the present 2,000 a week rate, only 20,000 of the remaining 74,000 voting age Negroes would be put on the rolls before the election.

The Department considered this access to registration to be inadequate, especially in

view of its reports indicating that Jefferson County registrars had for some years deliberately tried to slow down registration of Negroes.

On several occasions, in writing and verbally, high Justice Department officials had suggested that night registration and neighborhood registration be offered in Jefferson County. And when more than 800 Negroes were registered in Birmingham on Saturday, January 15, the Department figures that this definitely proved that large numbers of Negroes could not get to the courthouse during regular business hours. From this, they concluded that night registration would go a long way toward solving the problem.

A department spokesman said the Jefferson County board never responded to the several proposals for night registration. In fact, the board's latest letter to the Justice Department did not even mention the proposal, according to an official here.

In weighing the significance of this, the Department took into account reports in its files showing that Jefferson County had offered night registration in October 1964, during drives conducted mainly by white civic organizations.

"We held off sending in the Federal examiners as long as we could," explained a Department spokesman. "The 15 additional clerks for registration helped out for those who could come in during the day. And Saturday registration helped out for those who could not come in during the week. And night registration opportunity, it seemed to us, became a must, if there was to be a full compliance effort. But the county board's attitude was that it had gone as far as it intended to go."

Civil rights groups kept reminding the Department that Fulton County, Ga. (Atlanta), with roughly the same number of Negroes as Jefferson County, has 62,000 Negro voters to Jefferson's present registration of 41,930 Negroes; that New Orleans, with only a few thousand more than Birmingham in Negro population, has some 50,000 Negro voters.

But, more to the point, neither Atlanta nor New Orleans has an election coming up soon, and Birmingham does.

There were, of course, political and public opinion pressures on officials at both ends, in Birmingham as well as in Washington. At times these officials appeared to understand the other fellow's problems, at other times they didn't seem to be talking the same language.

Communications at the official level between Alabama and Washington, D.C., are better than they were a year or two ago. But there still seems to be plenty of room for improvement.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days later the Birmingham News in an editorial explains why the conclusions reached by our colleagues, **JIM MARTIN** and **JOHN BUCHANAN**, do not appear to be in harmony with the facts. The editorial in the Birmingham News of January 25, 1966, follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Jan. 25, 1966]

"WHO'S QUALIFIED" IS NO ISSUE

Fears have been expressed by some that Federal voting examiners who began operating in Jefferson County yesterday will register numbers of persons who otherwise would not be qualified to vote.

Such feeling appears to result mostly from misunderstanding of the examiners' procedures and of the qualifications which must be met before an applicant will be certified by the Federal officials as a qualified voter.

A check at both offices shows that a prospective voter must meet basically the same requirements whether he applies to county registrars or Federal examiners.

Part II of the "Application for Registrars

tion, Questionnaire and Oaths" form used by county registrars in Alabama—the section of the State voter registration form dealing with personal information about the applicant—contains some 40 questions.

CSC Form 805-A, "Application To Be Listed Under the Voting Rights Act of 1965," the form used by Federal examiners, contains only 11 questions.

But there is no reason to assume that the shorter Federal form opens the door to registration of people who could not qualify to vote if they applied to county registrars.

The Federal form requires an applicant under oath to state length of residency in the State and at his present address, and to declare whether he is a citizen of the United States, whether he has ever been convicted of a crime other than a traffic violation, and whether he has ever been declared legally insane by a court.

The Federal examiners disqualify prospective voters on the same grounds as county registrars—age, residency, citizenship, insanity, or conviction of a disqualifying crime. The Federal officials use the same Alabama list of disqualifying crimes used by county registrars.

The Federal examiners do not actually register an applicant. That responsibility still rests with the county board of registrars, who are furnished a list of names of individuals who have been issued Federal certificates of eligibility (CSC form 807).

Upon receipt of the list, the county registrars have 10 days to challenge any name on it—if, for example, investigation shows that the individual does have a criminal record which would disqualify him. (Such an individual also would be subject to Federal penalty if he had given false information to the examiners.)

Timothy Mullis of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, coordinator of Federal examiners in this region, said that if such a disqualification can be established even after the 10-day challenge period expires, the name can and will be removed administratively from the list of those certified to be eligible to vote.

The Federal examiners do not require an applicant to establish literacy or to state his educational level. The Jefferson County Board of Registrars has not been administering literacy tests to applicants since passage of the Voting Rights Act in August 1965, which forbids such tests in States which are affected.

Most of the challenges of those certified by Federal examiners in Montgomery County, where they have been working for some time, have been based on alleged illiteracy, according to Mullis. He said that such challenges have been summarily denied (that is, no hearing is scheduled as is provided for because the Voting Rights Act does not recognize literacy tests, challenges on such basis as criminal record, etc.). An appeal will be heard by a Federal appellate court in Jacksonville, Fla., next month, he said.

Jefferson County Board of Registrars Chairman W. M. Gwin's only criticism of the form being used by the Federal officials was that it required only that an applicant state his age rather than list his precise date of birth. Gwin said the birth date is needed to establish eligibility to vote (at 21) and exemption from poll tax payment (at 45).

Mr. Mullis said that although the form only requires the listing of age, the Federal examiners in practice are now including date of birth.

Gwin indicated that as long as the Federal examiners are furnishing that item of information on those they certify, he sees "no reason why we can't get along."

Gwin said that it might be necessary to put on additional clerical help to check for possible criminal records of voter applicants. Heavy registration by the county board in recent weeks already had caused a backlog

Far East is Communist China and that any steps we take which tend at drive an unwilling and fearful North Vietnamese Government irredeemably into the arms of Peiping are destructive of our ultimate objectives for the area.

Who Needs an Ombudsman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, television station WBBM-TV in Chicago carried an extremely interesting editorial on January 26 which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, particularly since proposals for establishment of an ombudsman have been suggested to the Congress.

I thoroughly agree with the editorial that any citizen who needs assistance today can get such assistance either from his Congressman or other representatives to various levels of government in the community.

Mr. Carter Davidson, editorial director of WBBM-TV, has performed a significant public service and effectively shot down trial balloons recently launched around here for creation of an ombudsman position.

The editorial follows:

WHO NEEDS AN OMBUDSMAN?

If we are not careful, we are going to get a new word in the language—and a new face on the public payroll. The word is "ombudsman." It comes from Sweden, and it means, literally, representative of the people. As it works in practice, the ombudsman speaks up for ordinary citizens like us, who get caught up in the tangles of governmental redtape.

You, yourself, may have had some experience in the frustration of trying to get something done, or a complaint heard, by some office of government. Chances are you ended up mumbling to yourself about "what chance does a little guy have trying to fight city hall?" In theory, an ombudsman, especially elected for the job, would fight your fight for you. And, in theory, it is a good idea. So good, in fact, that there have been proposals for establishing the position of ombudsman here in Illinois.

A bill to create such a post was introduced in the last session of the State legislature but got lost in the shuffle. The same was true in California, where we are told the ombudsman bill came close to passage. Now there is agitation in New York State to establish an ombudsman there.

We can be fairly sure the effort will be renewed in Illinois next year when the general assembly meets again. We do not need an ombudsman in Illinois, or in the city of Chicago. We already have several. All you have to do is use them. You have two U.S. Senators, your Representative in Congress, an alderman in city hall and a whole galaxy of State representatives and senators. They occupy the offices they hold because they promised you, at election time, they would represent your interests.

Write to them, or call them on the telephone. They are your ombudsman, your representatives. At least that's what they get paid for being, and the better ones earn their pay.

In our view, we don't need to hire an ombudsman to get us out of any tangles of governmental redtape. We need to use the representatives we already have. That's why we have them.

the Commission would devote its first 2 years to comprehensive planning. During the first year of its existence, the Commission is directed to convene a national assembly of representatives from the Federal Government, the States, and all interested groups. This assembly would discuss possible bicentennial activities and make recommendations to the Commission.

Based on the assembly's conclusions and its own preliminary work, the Commission would submit a full report to Congress within the first 2 years of its existence. As described in our bills, this report would include discussion of a great range of possible activities; recommendations for the allocation of financial and administrative responsibility among various public and private authorities and groups; and such legislative enactments and administrative actions as the Commission considers necessary.

In fulfilling its broad responsibility to plan, encourage, coordinate, and conduct bicentennial activities, the Commission would be authorized to consult, cooperate with, and seek advice and assistance from all appropriate Federal departments and agencies, State and local public bodies, learned societies, and historical, patriotic, philanthropic, civic, professional, and related organizations. Conversely, all Federal departments and agencies are authorized and requested to cooperate fully with the Commission, with more specific directives being given to the Secretary of the Interior, the Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities, and the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Archivist of the United States to develop appropriate activities and projects in their respective fields.

Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission is not designed nor intended to preempt the field and preclude, or even monitor, local and private efforts. Its goal is just the opposite: To encourage all interested groups, to offer information, to help provide advice and technical assistance, and to orchestrate a vast collection of activities and projects into a bicentennial of unprecedented scope, depth, and quality.

Toward this goal, the planning procedures established under this bill are especially important, for all possibilities must be surveyed and studied before final recommendations are made and final arrangements begun. The continuity of leadership provided by this Commission will be vital, too, for without it, the most careful planning could be for naught.

In developing this legislation, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and I have consulted with many interested individuals, and have studied the experience of previous commemorative commissions, particularly the Civil War Centennial Commission. In the weeks ahead, we will be seeking the advice and counsel of many groups and individuals throughout the Nation. We hope to obtain the interest and support of many of our colleagues in the House, so that an early hearing on this bill can be obtained.

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, a few short years from now, between 1973 and 1983, we will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution, and the bicentennial of our national commitment to the principles of liberty and equality set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

There is no question that this bicentennial will be marked across the land by countless local, State, National and international activities, stretching through a full decade, under the auspices of innumerable public authorities, learned societies, and historical, civic, patriotic, philanthropic, and professional organizations and groups.

There is no question that we will enjoy a great range of conferences and convocations, scholarship and analysis, and pomp and pageantry.

There is no question that this bicentennial will be the greatest celebration in the history of our Republic—but there is no assurance that it will be as great, as thoughtful, and as mature as the occasion requires. I personally believe that it is the ideals rather than the relics of the Revolution that we should emphasize.

Given the magnitude of the bicentennial, and the wealth of talents and resources involved, careful planning and comprehensive coordination are both difficult and essential. In my judgment, the job can only be done by a blue-ribbon national commission with ample time and authority, and with the confidence and cooperation of the many groups and agencies involved.

Last week the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and I introduced identical bills, H.R. 12252 and H.R. 12260, to establish an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission as the best agency for this tremendous task.

The Commission we propose would have 31 members, including the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House; 4 Senators and 4 Representatives; the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities; and 15 members from private life, appointed by the President. The President, Vice President, Speaker of the House, and the five executive-branch officials designated would be ex-officio members of the Commission.

Because the full dimensions of the bicentennial cannot be determined at once,

February 3, 1966

The absence of such laws not only protects the corrupt or the incompetent, it contributes to the ignorance that puts freedom in jeopardy.

Ike and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying to see the wide support the President has received for his decision to resume air strikes in North Vietnam. It seems to me that of these, none is more important than the forthright, strong statement by President Eisenhower.

The former World War II supreme commander believes that President Johnson acted in the only way possible. His support of renewed air action over North Vietnam is without reservation.

General Eisenhower's outspoken endorsement of the President's decision to resume bombing in the north after the 37-day pause is both "timely and welcome," the Washington Star commented in a February 2 editorial entitled "Ike and Vietnam."

The Star reiterated General Eisenhower's belief that President Johnson "unquestionably has made the correct decision in ordering resumption of the bombing."

General Eisenhower has made it clear that if we fail in Vietnam we would have to face the aggressors on other battlefields in southeast Asia. And he added:

"I'm for winning the battle here (in Vietnam) and not in some more remote place not of our own choosing."

The words of this beloved former President and wise commander will be heard—and listened to. We are indeed fortunate to have his advice and the President to have his support. Because my colleagues may want to peruse the editorial to which I have referred, I hereby submit it for publication in the RECORD.

IKE AND VIETNAM

It is no secret that General Eisenhower in the main has approved and supported the policies which the Johnson administration has been following in Vietnam.

Nevertheless, his outspoken endorsement of the President's decision to resume bombing in the north after the 37-day pause is both timely and welcome. It is timely because the President, during the past few days, has been under heavy attack in the Senate, primarily from a minority group of liberal Democratic Senators. Despite the fact that they are in the minority, however, the continuing criticism in the Senate is bound to contribute to confusion in the country and in some degree to shake public confidence in the soundness of Mr. Johnson's decision.

So the vigorous statement from the former President, in whose administration we first began giving aid to Saigon, is welcome. His two overwhelming Presidential victories testify to the size of his following in the United States. And most of the American people, we believe, will prefer his judgment to that of the Morses, the Fulbrights, and the Gavins.

In an interview with the New York Times, Mr. Eisenhower said the President "unquestionably has made the correct decision in ordering resumption of the bombing. An indefinite pause, he added, would only give 'sanctuary to those responsible for sending guerrilla forces and supplies into South Vietnam' in the effort to impose their will on the Government and people of that country."

Mr. Eisenhower has no sympathy at all with the comments from Senators to the effect that we are escalating the war while "playing at brinkmanship with a nuclear world war III." He also rejects General Gavin's suggestion that we should lodge our forces in coastal enclaves while pursuing peace efforts. What, he asked, would the Vietcong be doing throughout the rest of South Vietnam while U.S. forces sat securely in their enclaves?

If we fail in Vietnam, he continued, we would have to face the aggressors on other battlefields in southeast Asia. And the World War II Supreme Commander concluded with this: "I'm for winning the battle here (in Vietnam) and not in some more remote place not of our own choosing."

A beleaguered and harassed President needs the support of all Americans, especially those in a position to know what they are talking about. For this reason if for no other we are glad that General Eisenhower has seen fit to speak out forthrightly at this critical time.

Mrs. Marcos, the First Lady of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the more charming advantages of our democratic form of government is the prominent role that is given to the First Lady. Because we in America have been blessed with a succession of outstanding First Ladies and because we are cognizant of the influence that a First Lady can exert in a country, we look with great respect and expectation to the new First Lady of the Philippines—Mrs. Ferdinand Marcos.

Mrs. Marcos recently demonstrated a keen awareness of the importance of her role when she said in an interview with Ligaya Fruto of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin that her goal during her husband's tenure is to work toward the advancement of the arts. She is particularly interested in establishing a national theater and a national museum. As a member of one of the oldest political clans of the Philippines and as a graduate of the St. Paul's College and the Philippine Women's University College of Music and Arts, she is unusually well qualified for the task.

The people of the Philippines look to Mrs. Marcos not only as a leader in the arts, but also as a symbol of the good that will come to them during the administration of President Marcos. As a person who has met Mrs. Marcos and who has been completely charmed by her beauty and personality, I believe that the

people of the Philippines will not be disappointed.

I commend for your reading the interesting article by Miss Fruto, about the First Lady of the Philippines which appeared in the January 18, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

MRS. MARCOS SEEKS PHILIPPINE ISLANDS NATIONAL THEATER, MUSEUM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Star-Bulletin staff writer Ligaya Fruto left the Philippines yesterday aboard the liner *President Cleveland* for her return to Hawaii. She has been on an extensive tour of the Far East. This latest article is an exclusive interview with the new First Lady of the Philippines, Mrs. Ferdinand Marcos.)

(By Ligaya Fruto)

MANILA, PHILIPPINES.—"To keep up with Ferdinand (Marcos) you have to have some kind of a mind," said Mrs. Marcos, First Lady of the Philippines, who is noted for the beauty of her face and form.

Filipinos torn by political strife, repeated disillusionment, and the economic and moral ills that threaten their survival are agreed on one thing:

They believe they have one of the most beautiful and capable First Ladies in the world today.

Tall for a Filipino and with the serene, honey-colored radiance of a true Malayan beauty, Imelda Romualdez Marcos has the warmth and charm which have swayed voters and impressed diplomats and make her the greatest asset to a man of Marcos' brilliance and ambition.

That she has a mind, too, she demonstrated during an interview in Malacanang Palace, the White House of the Philippines.

In a simple linen dress, with gold-toned pearl jewelry that were her husband's Christmas gifts to her, she looked as calm and unruffled at 11:30 a.m., as she must have looked at 8:30, or some 20 visitors before.

"I seem to be busier than Ferdinand," she laughed. "He was through for the morning three visitors ago. But I don't mind. It takes two to do a job like this."

"I have no illusions about the difficulty of this position. But although I am young in years (she's 33) and in experience, I know I can seek the counsel of older and wiser people."

"I have confidence that my husband and I can do the job."

Mrs. Marcos' pet project is the establishment of a national theater and a national museum.

"Filipinos by their heritage are musicians and artists," she explained. "Everywhere you go musicians are appreciated."

"Japan is now becoming the first nation in musical development in Asia. Why not the Philippines? We have the best musicians—everywhere—here."

"The same thing with culture. We've been using fine porcelain and china even before other peoples in the world. Yet our wonderful artifacts are gathering dust in some school warehouses, unseen and unappreciated."

"I'd like to ask Ferdinand to work for the passage of a bill to prevent artifacts from leaving the country. We should have them on display in a museum to show the richness of our culture."

A national theater and a museum are necessary if Filipinos are to be made aware of this heritage.

"Awareness is half the battle," she said.

"I have to work to get these two essential national institutions within the 4 years of Ferdinand's administration. No matter how much I might strive to get them done after his term, I may not have the influence to accomplish what I should."

"So I'll have to work hard in the next 4 years."

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A515

Ellison McKissick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Ellison McKissick, South Carolina, the South, and the United States lost a great humanitarian, a pioneer industrialist, and a great American.

Mr. McKissick was president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute in 1950. Thus honored by those in the textile industry, he very ably served the entire industry and our country during a critical period of world history.

The following splendid editorial, which is a fitting eulogy to Mr. McKissick, appeared in the Greenville News on February 2, 1966:

ELLISON SMYTH MCKISSICK

The story of the life of Ellison Smyth McKissick, the manner in which he lived it, the productive uses to which he put it, and the accomplishments which marked it, should be an inspiration to the builders of the new South for generations.

An engineer by profession, a gentleman by instinct, and a textile pioneer by circumstance and choice, Mr. McKissick made an extraordinarily strong impression on his era.

Wherever the name was known, it was highly respected among business and industrial leaders. Wherever the man himself was known, he was held in esteem and affection.

And nowhere was this more vividly illustrated than by the regard held for him by the men and women who worked, not for him but with him for that was his method of operation, in the family enterprise he, his father and sons acquired and developed in part but mainly built from the ground up.

They have kept it a family enterprise by daring to try the new and to be different in this day of stock trades and mergers. Many textile innovations started in McKissick-owned and operated plants, for Mr. McKissick had an affinity for new ideas. One of the most recent rounds of wage increases started in the Alice Manufacturing Co. of Easley.

Mr. McKissick's relations with his employees, or coworkers, was highly personal. He knew hundreds of them by name and many present employees are of the second and third generations to find careers in his plants. In lean times, he helped to provide schools, homes, and churches for his people. In better times, he shared the profits of the company with them.

Mr. McKissick was noted for a personal diffidence unusual in a man of his accomplishments. Although a man of many talents, he abhorred the public spotlight.

Some years ago a reporter for the News approached Mr. McKissick with the idea of doing a story on his ability as an architect-engineer. At the time the textile executive was busy drawing up the plans for a new mill, something few if any of his contemporaries could have done. Courteously but firmly the reporter was rebuffed and told—without a trace of sarcasm but with simple honesty—that in Mr. Kissick's opinion there were any number of things more interesting to report.

He was literally and figuratively a builder of the southern textile industry. He headed some of its organizations and liaison committees and led it into new and better paths. When he decided to expand, or build a new plant, the result was invariably something different and more modern.

Personally, he was strikingly handsome and courtly in manner, treating all men, great or humble, as equals. His quiet manner never quite hid the spring steel of the war hero he was in 1917-18 or the compassionate but firmly competent industrialist he became.

We extend to his family, to whom he imparted so many of his fine qualities, our deepest sympathy. We and thousands of others share their loss and their grief.

H.R. 12456 and H.R. 12478—Horton Bills To Attack Water PollutionEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. FRANK HORTON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce my introduction of two new legislative measures, H.R. 12456 and H.R. 12478, to focus an increasing Federal attack on the Nation's leading natural resources problem, water pollution.

One of the lessons of living is that we do not always see everything we are paying for and sometimes we do not even realize how high these costs are. Water pollution is a prime example. This contamination of streams, rivers, and lakes is expensive for every one of us.

Pollution increases the cost to municipalities and industries of obtaining fresh water, it impairs recreational resources making them more costly to maintain, and poisons in the water around us destroy useful aquatic life.

I have developed a special interest in water pollution because of my service on the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. Among our accomplishments so far was persuading the President to issue an Executive order directing all Federal agencies in the Nation to clean up their own facilities.

A second attack came with the passage by Congress last year of the Water Quality Act. This legislation provides for the establishment and enforcement of antipollution standards in interstate streams. It also increases Federal financial assistance for construction of community sewage plants.

However, I feel there is much more to be done to control water pollution, and with that in mind I introduced this new legislation to cope with the ever-increasing problem.

One bill, H.R. 12478, gives a tax incentive to industries that build waste treatment works.

The second bill, H.R. 12456, amends present Federal law to further help cities, towns, and villages improve their sewage facilities.

These legislative proposals are intended to make an effective end to water pollution a national priority by encouraging local governments to match greater Federal assistance and by stimulating businesses to spend the money necessary to control pollution-causing conditions from their factories.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of my colleagues to these measures and urge their prompt and positive consideration.

Will Television Enter the House?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a recent editorial in the Keene, N.H., Evening Sentinel, reprinted from the Newport, N.H., Argus-Champion. It refers to a bill which Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, and I introduced along with eight of our colleagues. I am pleased to include the editorial at this point:

IGNORANCE DANGEROUS

The antics of scoop-happy, irresponsible news hawks in the coverage of the Lindbergh kidnaping trial constitute one of the most disgraceful chapters in the history of American journalism.

Worst than that, the public reacted to them in a series of Government edicts restricting the use of microphone and camera edicts that today are helping to produce an ignorant electorate.

Because of the excesses that made a circus of what should have been a most serious trial of an accused man who eventually went to the electric chair, the courts of the United States wrote canon 35, which holds that the use of a microphone or camera in the courtroom "is calculated" to destroy the dignity of the court.

In the 31 years since that trial, however, cameras and microphones have been improved so that their presence would not even be noticed in a courtroom and most newsmen have developed a realistic sense of responsibility.

So the rule that prevents the use of camera or microphone to help the public understand the conduct of our courts, is as obsolete as the star chamber proceeding that the open trial is supposed to prevent.

In the interest of freedom, of intelligent self-government, we need more of the realistic reporting of public affairs that can be reinforced by the use of microphone and camera.

New Hampshire ought to be proud that Second District Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND is taking the lead in trying to give the people of America the right to know what their House of Representatives is doing.

He has introduced bills that would permit the use of microphone and camera in the House of Representatives. Presidents of the United States, he notes, can cause electronic reporting from the House, but when they leave the Hall the microphones and cameras go too.

"In my opinion, this is wrong," he says. "The electronic media, in the interests of elementary democracy, should be permitted to bring the public to the floor of the House to hear the debates which will decide their future."

Mr. CLEVELAND's bill ought to have the support of every Congressman who does not fear that it will expose his incompetence as crudity.

And its principles ought to be written into law not only in Washington, but in New Hampshire, to insure the right of every citizen to witness Government agencies at their work, and to look at every public record.

February 3, 1966

stepped up war on poverty, indeed, endorses a commitment deeper than any mere request for heavier poverty program funding.

The earlier success of Mr. Shriver as creator, nourisher, and deeply sensitive administrator of the Peace Corps from infancy to international recognition made him a logical choice to lead on the battle front against poverty.

Mr. Shriver will now have the challenging task, of testing of possible weapons for a home front war on poverty, then marshaling of the most suitable brains, stratagems, and agencies into a full scale task force capable of achieving victory.

It is a tribute to the toughness of a man that Mr. Shriver was able to stretch himself so thin for so long at both the Peace Corps job and the poverty war assignment. This toughness seemed at odds with the high degree of sensitivity with which he met every driving inquiry of every American youth seeking fresh challenge, and new idealism in the Peace Corps.

Those who have observed and admired the work of Mr. Shriver under two Presidents have no doubt that he will breathe into his new full time job the same dedication and inspiration that made the Peace Corps accepted around the world—and at home as well.

President Johnson has made a good selection and the Nation should benefit from it.

VN

Australia Supports Decision To Resume Bombing

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, reactions to President Johnson's recent decision to resume bombing of military targets in North Vietnam have come from nations around the world. Undoubtedly one of the most significant of these, however, has been the expression of support and endorsement registered by the Australian Government through the country's Prime Minister, the Right Honorable Harold Holt.

The fact that the Australian Government speaks here as a participant in and not a mere observer of the defense of South Vietnam from Communist aggression gives this statement validity and importance. As one of the countries who share our commitment to uphold the rights and dignity of the people of South Vietnam, Australia stands firm in recognizing this decision as "realistic and necessary."

Prime Minister Holt fully points out the true significance of the sincere and genuine efforts of the United States toward peaceful negotiations. Regrettably, in Peiping and Hanoi those efforts were met by repeated accusations of insincerity. Further demonstrating its contempt for those efforts, North Vietnam used the bombing lull to rebuild its own war machine.

Prime Minister Holt puts the vital issues relating to the resumption of bombing into perspective. I, therefore, recommend his statement to my colleagues.

TEXT OF STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA, THE RIGHT HONORABLE HAROLD HOLT, ON FEBRUARY 1, 1966

President Johnson has made a statement about the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam directed against installations and transport routes used for the conduct of warfare in South Vietnam.

The bombing was suspended in December, even though an earlier pause in bombing last May had evoked no positive response, and even though there were strong military reasons for the continuance of bombing. The North Vietnamese authorities had, for a period of months, increased the rate of infiltration of armed men to South Vietnam. In the last 6 months of 1965, many thousands of North Vietnamese soldiers entered South Vietnam as units and equipped for open warfare.

The purpose of the bombing has been not to destroy the regime in Hanoi or break the economy of North Vietnam, or to shatter the basis of the people's livelihood, but to damage or destroy those military installations and facilities which enable Hanoi to supply and support its own forces in the south and those of the Vietcong.

The suspension of the bombing was of a very substantial military and political significance. It meant a self-imposed denial by the United States of the use of a valuable military weapon. It was part of a program of action designed to encourage North Vietnam to turn back from its course of increasingly open military intervention in South Vietnam. Having suspended the bombing, the United States undertook active diplomatic efforts to make known its genuine wish for an end to the warfare and for discussion leading to a just solution by peaceful means. Governments of Communist countries and of nonaligned countries which might possess some influence in Peiping and Hanoi were approached. Direct contacts were made in some capitals where the United States and North Vietnam were both represented.

From Washington and Saigon, the Australian Government was kept fully informed of these developments. Mr. Averell Harriman visited Canberra for discussions with us. The approaches made by the United States were widely welcomed throughout the world. But regrettably, brought no sign of any disposition on the part of the other side to modify its determination to continue the war. On the contrary, the North Vietnamese took advantage of the respite from bombing to repair and improve their system of infiltration. A considerable volume of traffic has passed through this system into South Vietnam; certainly in larger volume and at a faster rate than would have been possible if bombing had been continued to impede it.

Private contacts brought forth no positive responses. Peiping, Hanoi and the Liberation Front have denounced the U.S. efforts, describing them as a maneuver to cover up an intensification and expansion of aggressive war in Vietnam. The Liberation Front pledges itself to make greater efforts to strike harder at the heads of the aggressors, deal them heavier punishments and make them realize that their only honorable path at the present time is a quick withdrawal from South Vietnam. The latest U.S. initiatives have thus been rejected as summarily and emphatically as have other efforts made in the past.

It has consistently been the view of the Australian Government that North Vietnam must not be permitted to remain a haven immune from military risk, from which military aggression against the south can be mounted with impunity. Because we believe North Vietnam cannot be left free to mount military operations against South Vietnam and against the American, Australian, New Zealand, and Korean soldiers who are helping to defend the country, we firmly

support the American decision as realistic and necessary. It remains our hope, however, that the North Vietnamese and those associated with them will recognize that their aggression will not be allowed to succeed. We must hope that the time is not distant when they will join in finding a just and peaceful solution. While the aggression continues, it will be met firmly by resistance in which Australia will play its part. We know that the United States will remain alert and ready to explore any indication of willingness on the other side to move towards a settlement on just terms.

The U.S. readiness in this respect is indicated by the request of the U.S. Government for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in Vietnam.

Letter to United Nations Special Committee on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of a letter I have received, dated January 24, 1966, and addressed to the United Nations Special Committee on the situation with regard to the implementation of the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. I am sure the contents of this letter will be of great interest to all my colleagues:

To CONSIDER SOVIET RUSSIAN COLONIALISM IN UKRAINE

JANUARY 24, 1966.

To the United Nations Special Committee on the Situation With Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since I have as yet received no answer to my charge against the Soviet Government of May 6, 1963, on the matter of an investigation into Russian colonialism in Ukraine, I beg, apropos of the murder of Stefan Bandera, leader of the Ukrainian anticolonial liberation movement, who, on the instructions of the Government of the U.S.S.R., was on October 15, 1959, murdered on the soil of a foreign, sovereign state, the Federal Republic of Germany, to renew today in my capacity as head of the last independent Ukrainian government on Ukrainian soil my charge against the Soviet Government and especially against Alexander Shelepin, as organizer of the murder.

On this occasion I also base my case on the investigation made by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary under the leadership of Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and others.

The U.S. Senate committee has investigated the methods of the Government of the U.S.S.R. employed particularly on the captive nations, and has reached the conclusion that murder and kidnaping are instruments of the official Soviet policy. The Government of the U.S.S.R. has used these methods in Ukraine in particular, as well as on freedom leaders living abroad. The U.S. Senate has published the sentence and oral opinion and written elaboration of the verdict of the

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A511

The mandate from Congress to the Department of Agriculture is that it be responsive to the wishes of the farmers concerned in producing milk it is hardly doing that.

Recent hearings on the marketing order clearly demonstrated that producers shipping to the Philadelphia milkshed overwhelmingly favor the present marketing arrangement.

The dispute now raging does not affect prices to the consumer. It does, though, seriously affect dairy farmers, many of them in Kent and Cecil Counties, where the annual loss under the proposed change would amount to almost a million dollars.

These farmers want violators punished. It is to their interest to eliminate the chiseling brokers and crooked middlemen who take kickbacks from unscrupulous suppliers.

There is no reason why the USDA can't change the present order to make it enforceable.

While the price to the consumer may not be affected, the loss to the economy right here in Kent County would be seriously felt. Thus it behoves, not only the milk-producing farmers but all of us to do something about it.

Congressman ROGERS C. B. MORTON, gave great support to the milk producers during the recent Federal hearings in Philadelphia. We suggest you, all of us, write him in support of our farmers.

We suggest, further, that letters be addressed to CARLTON R. SICKLES, Maryland's Congressman at large, who has been most receptive to appeals for support on Eastern Shore matters.

This possible loss to our economy should not be taken without a fight. It is your battle as well as that of the farmer-milk producers. Pitch in.

O'Hare-to-Midway Crewless Skybus Called Possibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times carried a most revealing article by its distinguished writer, Fletcher Wilson, on the possibility of linking Chicago's Midway Airport with O'Hare Field in Chicago through the use of a new skybus service.

My colleagues are aware of my continuing effort to reactivate Midway so that some of the congestion we now experience at O'Hare, and in particular, the long delay in the holding pattern before landing, can be alleviated by transferring a greater degree of flight operations from O'Hare to Midway.

I was very pleased to learn that Mr. George L. DeMent, one of the most respected constituents in my congressional district, who serves as chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority has indicated that possibilities exist for linking Midway with O'Hare through this new type of transportation.

There is no question that one of the main deterrents for reactivating Midway on the major scale has been a lack of rapid transit connection between the two airports.

Many of my colleagues here in Congress who travel from Washington to Chicago and then catch connecting flights to their respective districts, I am sure, will share my great pleasure in learning that the efforts to improve traffic service at O'Hare by reactivating Midway continue to draw the attention of our top public officials.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 2, 1966]

O'HARE-TO-MIDWAY CREWLESS SKYBUS CALLED POSSIBILITY

(By Fletcher Wilson, Sun-Times correspondent)

PITTSBURGH.—George L. DeMent said here Tuesday, after riding an experimental skybus, that such a vehicle might someday serve to connect Chicago's O'Hare and Midway Airports.

The chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority said the crewless, rubber-tired bus run by computers on an elevated track would be a "natural" for transporting passengers between the two fields, if Midway becomes busy again.

DeMent and Bernard L. Marsh, Skokie Village manager, took a ride on the light-weight, automated mass transit system that travels in the air on a narrow stiltway.

Marsh and DeMent are among more than 1,100 persons gathered for the first International Conference on Urban Transportation. All the visitors have traffic troubles back home.

TOLD TO STAY AWAY

So many more came than were expected that interested Pittsburghers were told to stay away to make room.

The skybus is a monorail built by the Westinghouse Corp. in a public park here at a cost of nearly \$3 million.

The project was sponsored by the Port Authority of Allegheny County, operator of the Greater Pittsburgh Transit System, which still includes red streetcars.

Westinghouse subcontracted portions of the nearly 2-mile-long skybus system to 30 other companies.

Tuesday, for the first time, three 18,000-pound cars seating 28 and holding 70 persons, ran around the clock to show it could be done at one push of a button.

The cars operate at 50 miles per hour on a looped track set up on an attractive concrete and steel structure supported by single I-beam columns.

In addition to serving as a connection between airports, DeMent said, "the skybus would be right for carrying passengers from the Loop to McCormick Place if somebody would subsidize the operation."

"This is the most exciting transit development I have seen," he asserted.

Marsh said steps are being taken to acquire a strip of the old North Shore Line right-of-way, from the end of the Skokie Swift at Dempster in Skokie, 9,000 feet north to Old Orchard Road. The Chicago & North Western Railway now owns the land.

"Skybus trains or conventional buses could operate there," Marsh said. The project is dependent upon obtaining Federal or other funds and consent of the CTA to operate the line.

DeMent repeated to Marsh the CTA's traditional position:

"We will take on any line guaranteed not to show a loss."

AIRPORT CONTRACT

Westinghouse has signed a \$3 million contract to install a skybus at a new airport in Tampa, Fla., to carry passengers 1,000 feet from the terminal to airplane boarding areas. A college is inquiring about an installation.

The keynote speaker at the opening of the

3-day convention refined the Skybus concept.

Leland Hazard, chairman of the Rapid Transit Committee of the Allegheny Port Authority, spoke of a 10,000- to 12,000-pound car running on a structure trim and small enough to go anywhere in the city, even inside buildings.

Present transit cars range in weight from 45,000 pounds in Chicago to 80,000 in New York City.

"Here is the challenge," Hazard said.

"Do we have the wit to get rapid transit out of the ground? Do we have the engineering imagination to translate lower-weight cars into lower costs throughout the whole system; to make bridges across rivers, structures winding uphill, loops and loops within loops?"

Hazard, professor of industrial administration in the Graduate School of Carnegie Institute of Technology, said the system he envisions would bring a decline in the number of autos and buses per thousand population.

"No one need sell his motor stock," he declared.

"But some three-car families will fall to two. Some from two to one. And the percentage of no-car families will be larger because a higher percentage of people will live in high-rise apartments near the rapid transit lines."

City officials, legislators and members of civic organizations predominate among persons attending the conference.

Good Selection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this country has had the good fortune of having top administrators at the head of many departments and bureaus. Of these, none has worked harder or been more effective than R. Sargent Shriver.

Those of us who have had the opportunity to work with Mr. Shriver know that he has performed distinguished service on two fronts—as the head of the administration's war on poverty and as Director of the Peace Corps.

As the Nashville Tennessean has observed, the fact that Mr. Shriver will now devote his full time to fighting poverty demonstrates "the sincerity of President Johnson's expressed intentions to make certain that the poor shall not suffer fresh deprivations to finance an escalation of the Nation's Vietnam effort."

The Tennessean's editorial is a tribute to both the President's good judgment and Mr. Shriver's ability, and I ask permission to have it inserted in the RECORD.

Good SELECTION IN MR. SHRIVER

The sincerity of President Johnson's expressed intentions to make certain that the poor shall not suffer fresh deprivations to finance and escalation of the Nation's Vietnam effort is demonstrated by his latest action.

The Presidential decision to harness the full energies to Mr. Sargent Shriver to a

A502

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 3, 1966

lion for the current fiscal year. This included a direct appropriation of \$305 million, a contingency reserve of \$60 million to be used if needed, plus the \$37 million carryover from the contingency reserve authorized by the Congress in fiscal 1965 and released at the 11th hour by the Budget Bureau following repeated requests for such action from Members of the House and Senate. By impounding \$132 million of this money, the administration is flouting the expressed will of the Congress in regard to adequate funding of the REA electric program.

In view of these facts, I have urged the President to issue a directive to the Budget Bureau and to REA to utilize the entire \$402 million authorized by the Congress for fiscal 1966 to meet the loan needs of the rural electric cooperatives. In addition, I feel it is imperative that an REA deficiency loan fund be authorized for the current fiscal year in order to reduce the loan application backlog to a manageable size.

Since the \$270 million budget request for the REA electric program is patently inadequate to fill an expected \$413 million loan need in fiscal 1967, I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to join me in supporting an increase in the REA appropriation or the establishment of an adequate contingency reserve. Use of such a contingency reserve should be based on the need for funds by the Nation's 1,000 rural electric systems.

The Congress did not provide the fiscal 1965 and 1966 contingency reserves for the purpose of window dressing. The Congress intended this money to be used if and as needed. The need existed in fiscal 1965 and continues to exist in fiscal 1966, but the Budget Bureau has chosen to regard the contingency reserve as untouchable.

Mr. Speaker, the rural electric cooperatives of the Nation are developing a plan designed to bring outside supplemental capital into the program and thus to minimize the need for direct appropriations. In truly cooperative fashion, they are working on a proposal which would establish a cooperative bank for rural electric systems, a credit institution which the rural electrics would ultimately own and operate.

It is commendable that our rural electric co-ops are taking steps to implement such a forward-looking proposal. Congressional action will be necessary to put this plan into effect, and it will have my active support when it comes before the Congress. Meanwhile, we must assure that adequate funds are provided to meet the current needs of the rural electrics.

Legislation To Close American Ports to Ships Trading With North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to close American

ports to ships trading with North Vietnam.

My purpose in introducing this legislation is to serve notice on some of our allies that while we tolerate dissent from our war aims, we do not tolerate trade with our enemies in war material that menaces our own American troops.

The British are the worst offenders. The British Government will trade with anybody for a brass farthing. The British Government is hypocritical talking about the British Commonwealth while shipping goods to North Vietnam that support war against American and British Commonwealth troops from New Zealand and Australia.

The British have a history of maritime opportunism and self-serving. Britain may no longer rule the waves, but Britain still wavers the rules. The British can be made to comply with honor only through hard words and actions.

My bill will not affect many ships. The ships that trade in southeast Asian waters do not often call in American ports. The real intent of my legislation is to serve notice on our opportunistic allies that we had had enough of their trade with North Vietnam in war goods. I believe that adoption of my bill might be just what we need to make our point without harsher measures.

The War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. H. ALLEN SMITH OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Appendix today for the benefit of my colleagues a letter which I have received from a constituent of mine, Mr. Volney F. Morin, concerning the war in Vietnam. Mr. Morin is a veteran of World War II and the Korean war, and his letter is as follows:

Representative H. ALLEN SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Permit me to introduce myself as a voter in your district. Further, to introduce myself as one who volunteered for World War II on December 8, 1941, was honorably discharged on December 9, 1945 after 3 years of overseas duty, 3,000 flying hours, combat service in three theaters of war, and a commission as a lieutenant senior grade in the U.S. Navy. Further, as one who served in the Korean hostilities for a full 18 months in the theater, as a judge advocate with the rank of major in the U.S. Air Force. From this background, you will understand I am not a pacifist.

I find myself increasingly alarmed at the impossible war situation in Vietnam.

This letter is written as the strongest possible form of missive request that you and the recipients thereof do everything within your power to withdraw U.S. troops, or take the responsibility of declaring war under article I, section 8, of the Constitution and thereafter obliterating North Vietnam. The administration appears to be confused about

the nature of war. The aim of war is to kill and destroy the enemy in sufficient number so that the survivors may be told what to do. It is not to force someone to a bargaining table. This view is nonsense.

We must stop the useless sacrifice of our men in an alien jungle to satisfy a useless escalation to nowhere. War is the most serious business in which men can engage. It must either be conducted with the sole aim of victory, or it must be abandoned.

Please follow either course—abandonment or victory—but do everything you can to end our own Government's useless position of fighting on the mainland of Asia with weapons of the enemies' choosing.

The courtesy of a response is not requested.

Sincerely,

VOLNEY F. MORIN.

Speaking in Unison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there has been some talk about "consensus" in recent months.

For most of the latter half of 1965 we on our side of the aisle were talking of the rising signs of inflation. But a consensus was lacking, since the White House insisted there was no problem of inflation.

Now that has all changed. The change is described well in the following editorial from the Evening Star of Washington for February 2:

SPEAKING IN UNISON

William McChesney Martin, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, found himself a rather lonely man as 1965 ended.

He had served notice back in August that he was worried about the possibility of inflation. By November, when word got around that the Federal Reserve was thinking of tightening up money by increasing the discount rate, the reaction from the administration was not long in coming.

Treasury Secretary Fowler, following the easy-money, expansionist philosophy of the White House, declared that such an increase to dampen inflation would be "premature and unwise." Within the next few days a startling example of the Johnson treatment ensued. Commerce Secretary Connor and Labor Secretary Wirtz in separate speeches suggested there was still plenty of room in the economy for expansion without inflation. Then Joseph Laitin, a White House press aid, told reporters the administration didn't "consider inflation a major threat at this time."

The climax to all this came December 2 when the President himself told the Business Council in Washington that economic growth in 1966 would not be accompanied by inflation. "We can produce the goods and services we require," he declared, "without overheating our economy."

The rest, of course, is history. Martin & Co. ignored the drumfire of pronouncements and announced a raise in the discount rate December 5. The President, obviously displeased, deplored the action and said it should have been postponed until the Federal Reserve had the "full facts."

Well, a funny thing has happened at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. In his economic message the other day, the President conceded

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A501

and understanding on which to base their civic decisions. Here is a suggested general framework on which many variations can and should be made, both to improve the scheme and to provide the variety necessary for preserving public appeal.

ii. Comparison

So that the candidates can be accurately compared with each other—the essential element of the voter's decision—they should be presented together and engaged in addressing themselves to the same matters.

If there are no more than three candidates and if they can and will join the issues, the debate format provides both enlightenment and drama. It should not be forgotten that understanding and amusement are not mutually exclusive, that light is not necessarily dull.

Another format, and one of more general application, is to have the candidates answer the same questions. No rehearsal, no advance notice. Camera work should make the person's appearance as realistic as possible—to show the "real them." No teleprompter, no reading of speeches prepared by someone else. No cosmetics, except perhaps as a corrective measure where a person looks worse on TV than on the street.

Further, candidates should be examined by a single interrogator so that consecutive thinking can be followed, and responsive answers can be pressed for, while with several questioners a question more easily can be evaded.

To undertake this, a station must take the initiative in providing a skilled and fair interrogator and seeing that he is properly prepared. The problem of fairness is a difficult one because a questioner can conceal a bias far more easily than the witness, the candidate, who must take positions, even if they are blurred. The interrogator's responsibility is a large one because although he cannot misquote a candidate as a writing reporter can, he can misrepresent him by guiding the subject and influencing the tone of the discussion.

The questions should emphasize the important issues. In this way the general neglect of them can be compensated, while the responses cannot but help to disclose the personality of the candidates.

This format should be made an adversary proceeding for the joint purposes of bringing out the truth and dramatizing the spectacle. Wigmore claimed that the practice of cross-examination constituted the most powerful engine for eliciting the truth. Cross-examination combined with television tends to make a penetrating engine for the electoral process.

iv. CONCLUSION

Our medium's nature, so aggressive in comparison to the passive book on the bookshelf, makes it a fitting instrument to provide members of the public with some of the things which they ought to have in addition to those for which they ask.

Water Project Rules Could Be Guide for All Federal Spending Proposals**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

MR. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the editorial from the Huron, S. Dak., *Plainsman*, under date of January 26, 1966, pointing out the intensified

trend to Federal intervention in the life of Americans through the \$112.8 billion budgetary program of the President.

This editorial might have been even stronger had the Watson report been available at the time it was written, the report which proposes to guarantee to everyone in America a certain income, regardless of their desire or ability to work.

The editorial follows:

WATER PROJECT RULES COULD BE GUIDE FOR ALL FEDERAL SPENDING PROPOSALS

Intensification of the trend to Federal intervention and control of many aspects of American life is apparent in the \$112.8 billion budget sent to Congress Monday by President Johnson.

The budget, which advances the causes of the Great Society, aid to education, slum eradication, and direct aid to the impoverished, is woven of the threads of Government control and massive Federal programs in which administrators, not the local people involved, will have the final determination.

In education, for instance, the President proposes Government subsidy of bank loans to college students from low-income families and Government guarantee of all other loans. This would take the place of the present plan where colleges lend Government funds to qualified students and would eliminate the local determination of a college administrator that an education loan is warranted.

And in spite of the protests over the application of Federal guidelines for spending of Federal school aids approved in the last session, the President is seeking more money to be spent on the children in the impoverished areas according to Federal rules, not as determined by the local administrators who know better, perhaps, the needs of their own schools.

Big cities, long the beneficiaries of Government aid in urban renewal and related projects, now will be eligible for Federal purchase of park land and open spaces and service centers for the dense population areas. This is an open political grab for masses of votes.

Despite the allegation of politics and inefficiency in the poverty war and the questionable need for these programs with dropping unemployment, the President asks for another \$890 million for an effort which has accomplished very little.

Tucked away in the total request is a small amount—\$2 million—for the Garrison irrigation project construction. This project was approved by Congress when the people themselves in the area involved showed they wanted irrigation and were willing to repay the Federal investment. This is one Federal expenditure which was sought by the people involved and which will be financed in the long run by the people benefited.

If other Federal programs had this prerequisite of local support and repayment contracts, the budget might be lower and the danger of Federal intervention and bypassing of local governmental units certainly would be greatly reduced.

Budget Cuts for REA Would Be Ruinous to Program**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

MR. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in studying the administration's proposed budg-

et for fiscal 1967, I was appalled to note that the loan level for the REA electric program has been slashed to \$270 million. In addition, I understand that the administration has impounded \$132 million of the \$402 million authorized by Congress for use in the electric loan program during fiscal 1966.

The catastrophic effect which these proposals would have on our rural electrification program is apparent when you consider the fact that over \$675 million in electric loan applications are either on hand at REA now or will be submitted by the close of the current fiscal year. If the fiscal 1966 program is cut back to \$270 million, loan applications totaling better than \$400 million cannot be considered because of a lack of funds.

This staggering backlog of loan applications will then have to be carried over to fiscal 1967, where it will be added to the \$413 million in new applications which the rural electric cooperatives have indicated they will be submitting to REA in fiscal 1967. Obviously, the \$270 million electric loan program proposed in the administration's fiscal 1967 budget cannot begin to take care of the fiscal 1966 backlog, let alone the new applications.

Mr. Speaker, I am vitally concerned with the economic and social well-being of the rural area which I have been privileged to represent in Congress for the past 24 years. Because of this, I have a deep and longstanding interest in the operations of the numerous Federal programs which have been designed to combat poverty and aid in the development of rural America.

Unfortunately, many of these programs appear to be missing their goal. This criticism cannot be made of the REA electric and telephone program. Like the Farmers Home Administration and the Small Business Administration programs, the REA program operates at the grassroots level. Its accomplishments are of direct, immediate, and lasting benefit to the rural areas served by REA's electric and telephone borrowers.

The 10 rural electric cooperatives in my home district in Wisconsin have done much more than simply providing lights to their 43,073 consumer-members and their families. The power furnished by these co-ops is making possible the recreational and industrial developments which are so essential to the revitalization of our depressed rural economy.

Some of the Federal lending programs are of the type which can be deferred temporarily without lasting damage. However, this is not true of REA. Adequate financing is the lifeblood of the rural electric systems. It is not enough to string some electric lines in rural America and then consider that the job of rural electrification has been completed. Our rural electric cooperatives must have access to adequate amounts of growth capital if they are to be able to furnish the increasing amounts of electricity required by a growing rural economy. If a budgetary tourniquet is applied to REA loan funds, the productive capacity of our rural areas will be the real victim of the resulting anemia.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress recognized this basic truth when it provided for an REA electric loan program of \$402 mil-

February 3,

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A503

that avoiding inflation is "perhaps our most serious economic challenge in 1966." He spoke of a possible further tax increase and even hinted that price controls may lie ahead to cope with the problem.

It's nice to know that he and Mr. Martin are now in accord on the inflation hazard. But it does seem odd that the Federal Reserve arrived at this conclusion nearly 2 months ago. It suggests that Congress showed extraordinary wisdom back in 1913 when it created the Federal Reserve as a body independent of the Chief Executive and political pressures.

Address of Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have included in the Appendix of the Record the address of Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, at the 81st annual meeting of the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce, Aberdeen, S. Dak., on Thursday, January 20, 1966, in which he discussed the Vietnam situation.

General and Mrs. Johnson share a warm place in the hearts of many South Dakotans and, particularly, in Aberdeen. Mrs. Johnson was born and reared in Aberdeen and lived there while her husband was serving in the Pacific during World War II and during his ordeal as a Japanese prisoner of war after Bataan.

General Johnson joined his wife in Aberdeen at the end of the war. They became well-known and respected citizens in the community. The Johnsons still cherish the many friendships founded during the time they lived there.

General Johnson was the subject of the cover story of the December 10, 1965, issue of Time magazine.

The speech follows:

I am sure that you have heard many times why we are in Vietnam, but it bears repeating. I have found it difficult to find a better expression of our obligation than one written in a letter by a young Army captain to his wife shortly before he was killed in action. This letter was not written for publication although his wife subsequently permitted it to be published. It was a private communication between husband and wife, where the husband was expressing better than most of us can some of his innermost thoughts and feelings. I quote:

"I feel that there is too much talk of despair. * * * Above all, this is a war of mind and spirit. And it is a war which can be won no matter what present circumstances are. For us to despair would be a great victory for the enemy. We must stand strong and unafraid and give heart to an embattled and confused people. This cannot be done if America loses heart. * * * Please don't let them back where you are selling me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty and of victory—for we must and we can win here. There is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us everywhere we go. We have drawn the line here and the Amer-

ica we all know and love best is not one to back away."

It is important for people to understand that while someone must spring to the immediate defense of the freedoms that we enjoy today, all of us have a stake in the outcome. Thus, it becomes important for us to be knowledgeable, and to keep a perspective as well as a sense of proportion about today's events and activities in Vietnam.

TACTICAL CHANGES

During the past 2 years I have made four trips to South Vietnam and returned from my most recent one just 3 weeks ago today. Two changes of major significance have occurred during this 2-year period. Two years ago, the Vietnamese Army, bolstered by a limited American advisory effort plus significant American materiel and hardware, was battling small Vietcong units that would concentrate periodically in battalion size of about 400 to 500 men for a specific engagement and then disperse.

These enemy formations were receiving directions on a weekly or sometimes more frequent basis from Hanoi, and the South Vietnamese Army was just barely holding its own. Today, those same gallant Vietnamese soldiers are battling battalions and regiments of Vietcong who have now been reinforced by major elements of at least three divisions of North Vietnamese troops. They continue to receive direction from Hanoi, but on a daily and sometimes an hourly basis.

However, significant friendly support has now come to the assistance of the Vietnamese. Korea, with her intimate knowledge of the terror, the humiliation, and the devastation associated with Communist aggression, has provided a combat division. Australia, an ultimate objective of Communist expansion in the Pacific, is providing an infantry battalion, some airlift forces, advisers, and medical teams. This Australian battalion has just completed an operation in the Iron Triangle area north of Saigon, with elements of our 1st Infantry Division. New Zealand has sent both combat forces and civil assistance teams. Altogether, 38 nations are providing assistance either of a military or of an economic or civil support nature and, of course, we have committed our blood and our treasure.

COMMUNISTS INFILTRATE

How did all this come about?

Let's go out west to Bowdile. You are familiar with Bowdile and the way the people live in that community. Now in your imagination pick up Bowdile and set it down in the delta area of South Vietnam, about 40 miles south of Saigon. Picture a Vietnamese who unobtrusively returns to his community after a lapse of some years.

Unknown to his neighbors, he was Communist oriented. In a very cunning way, he soon ingratiated himself with one of the members of the town council and brought that council member under his influence. Perhaps he loaned him money; perhaps there was something in this council member's past of which he was ashamed and wanted to keep hidden.

The two of them then went to work on other members of the town council so that the Communist, after a period of time, could grasp a position of minor authority in order to increase his influence. In 2 years, 3 years, or 5 years that town council became deeply influenced by the Communists, if it were not an outright Communist organization.

At about the same period of time, unusual things began happening in that community. Strangers passed through who stayed only a day or two. Levies were placed on the villagers for a few pounds of food. Occasionally, a special, forced collection of money was taken up. Now strangers moved in and stayed. Occasionally, a man who appeared to be seriously injured was carried in on a stretcher and cared for by one of the villagers. Structural materials were brought

in, but there was no evidence of any construction. It had gone into caves, tunnels, and fortifications beneath the houses of some of the villagers.

The once friendly and happy air of the village turned into one of suspicion and fear. The district or county chief appeared in the village less frequently. The province or state chief never visited the village. Village officials, schoolteachers, and religious leaders who remained loyal to the government suddenly disappeared or were murdered. Government tax collectors were driven out and over a period of years, that village became a Vietcong village.

This course of events has been followed in many villages in South Vietnam. The number is not known, but there are about 10,000 hamlets in Vietnam, and these hamlets are grouped together into about 2,560 villages. In addition, there are major metropolitan areas such as Saigon, Da Nang, and Hue. Cells of Communists exist in the larger cities but the extent of their control is not the same as in the rural areas.

OTHER WEAPONS USED

To accelerate this process of infiltration and takeover, the Vietcong use the weapon of intimidation and terror, going to any extreme of brutality which they believe necessary to destroy the fabric of society. As a typical illustration, during the week of January 2-8, the Vietcong murdered 24 civilians, wounded 73, and kidnapped 328. Many of the civilians were province or hamlet officials, schoolteachers, or Buddhist monks. To portray the magnitude of these atrocities in relation to U.S. population, which is more than 12 times larger than the population of South Vietnam, the figure would be over 5,000 U.S. civilians killed, wounded, and kidnapped by the enemy during the week.

The takeover by infiltration of the political structure and by intimidation and terror apparently was too slow for the Communists, for, in 1959, they greatly intensified their efforts, and boosted them again in 1961. It was at this stage that additional American advisory effort and materiel were provided.

U.S. EFFORT BOOSTED

Today, you are aware of the growth of our effort. Our commitment of combat troops began in March 1965 with the landing of elements of the 3d Marine Division. This was necessary because increasing acts of terror and sabotage against installations where U.S. forces were located were endangering our assistance effort. In May, the Army's 173d Airborne Brigade was landed to provide protection for other installations.

Concurrently, we began to build a logistic base to support the combat troops we had committed. The adequacy of the logistic base is one of the items that tends to be somewhat puzzling to the general public and, from what I gather in my discussions with civilians, tends to be a cause of concern. Vietnam really had only one major port—the port of Saigon, which is located up a river that twists and turns and requires time to navigate. That port is required to receive the supplies for the population, supplies for an economic aid program and military supplies.

With the growth of the military effort, it is obvious that there is an equivalent growth in supplies required to sustain that effort. To meet the need, we are developing additional ports, one of the largest being Cam Ranh Bay. On December 26, I stood on a pier at Cam Ranh Bay that had been fabricated in Illinois, towed down the Mississippi River, across the Atlantic Ocean, through the Suez Canal and emplaced at Cam Ranh Bay. A ship was unloading on each side of that pier. We also have offloading points up the coast from Cam Ranh Bay. While there is still a backlog of shipping waiting discharge, this backlog is dissipating rapidly and I believe that we will catch up soon.

When you consider that Saigon is at the end of a supply line nearly 10,000 miles long and that it takes 19 days for a fast ship to make the trip, it takes time to build up stockpiles to sustain the military effort.

As an added complication, supplies that were ordered a month ago may have a lower priority for use by the time that they arrive. A combat action in Vietnam may have resulted in a heavier than planned consumption of some other items of supply that are on other ships. Moreover, many supplies that necessarily are shipped to Saigon have to be reloaded on other ships and carried up the coast. The Vietcong have cut a number of roads throughout South Vietnam; hence, it is safer and less costly to move supplies by sea to coastal ports and then inland. Of course, we have an extensive in-country air logistic system that also helps the supply problem.

As to the impact of this logistic buildup, many commanders volunteered the information to me while I was in Vietnam that there had been no combat action undertaken that was inhibited in any way by a lack of supplies. However, it is natural that in the early stages of a rapid buildup such as has occurred in Vietnam, that our support will be thin in places for varying periods of time. Normally, we try to have supplies on hand to support the troops for a considerable period. It should be evident that these supplies must be built up and at the present time our stockpiles are growing at a rapid rate. When I was there in December, we had then built up to well over one-half of what they ultimately will be. Thus, the fact that a ship is not unloaded does not mean that our soldiers are suffering for the supplies that are aboard that ship. We have a very solid foundation for a logistic system that will support whatever level of effort our President decides is necessary.

TROOPS ARE CONFIDENT

How and what are our troops doing? I spent about 8 days visiting just as many units as I could cover in that period of time, starting out early in the morning and finishing up late at night. Everywhere that I went our commanders and our soldiers were simply filled with confidence. They have demonstrated an ability to lick this treacherous, cunning enemy in direct combat. They have demonstrated an ability to dig him out of his tunnels and caves. They have demonstrated an ability to avoid his booby traps, his bear traps, his punji stakes, and his mines. We are still taking casualties every day from these devices, but our troops have learned to cope with them and are doing a simply magnificent job.

Our forces are confronted by two kinds of military action. First, because our helicopters enable us to range far and wide, we are searching out enemy formations so that they can be taken under attack.

This is a reassuring capability because we should be able to avoid being surprised by enemy mass formations and defeat the parts of the mass before they can assemble into an overwhelming force. This was done by the 1st Cavalry Division in the Ia Drang Valley Battle in mid-November. Second, we must continue to search out long established enemy hideout or safe haven areas. The battles that have occurred last week and going on into this week in places with strange names like Cu Chi, Lai Khe, and the Michelin Plantation are examples of this kind of action. Our forces have uncovered large quantities of supplies.

Last week for example, one unit discovered enough rice to feed three Vietcong regiments for about a year. Those regiments must now find another source of supply. Some of this they will attempt to take from the farmers and thus create an animosity that serves to dry up the sea in which the guerrilla fish swim, using Mao Tse-tung's expression.

At the same time, our forces are engaged in other kinds of constructive, country-building endeavors. They do not fight all the time. When they are not fighting, small teams are out helping the villagers rebuild schoolrooms, or building new ones, improving sanitation, providing fresh water, perhaps helping a widow repair her house. A most important activity is the valuable service performed by our medical personnel. Wherever our troops are located, our doctors and corpsmen are not only treating the sick, but are teaching the benefits of basic hygiene. They are giving of themselves and are giving heart, as Captain Spruill said, to an embattled people.

VietNAMESE FIGHT WELL

In reporting the events in South Vietnam today, our papers very naturally tend to highlight the activities of the U.S. forces and to a lesser degree the activities of the Australians and the Koreans. U.S. activities are described quite fully, although the actions in which casualties occur usually receive a special recognition. On the other hand, the thousands of actions that are conducted by the Vietnamese forces each day are largely overlooked.

I want to assure you that the Vietnamese are fighting and fighting well. They have demonstrated a very remarkable resilience and an amazing ability to absorb punishment, when one thinks back upon the number of years that they have been fighting. Do not discount the Vietnamese effort and do not get the impression or the idea that the United States is taking over the war. This is still a Vietnamese war, and while they are pulling all that their capabilities enable them to pull, they continue to need the help of the United States and other allies.

From my visits to Vietnam, I see a country in deep trouble. I see a country in need of unwavering help. I see a people ravaged by war because Hanoi and Peiping continue to export the tools of violence and to seek absolute political domination over the helpless. I see a succession of brutalities, of innocents murdered in the night, of kidnaps with no return, of exploded mines maiming children and parents in buses—all because Hanoi controls and fuels the aggression in South Vietnam. I see a determined people who have been fighting communism since 1954, bleeding in human lives on the average of 500 soldiers a week, desperately striving to establish political order so that they can live, prosper, and enjoy the blessings of freedom, in peace.

Yet, I also see that rather than cease aggression in the face of South Vietnamese resiliency and determination to resist, Hanoi has increased support of the Vietcong by infiltrating more supplies and North Vietnamese regular army combat forces. Thus, we have had to respond with combat forces to the South Vietnamese call for assistance, and until Hanoi halts its aggression, we must continue to defend freedom in South Vietnam.

WIDOW'S REPLY

I receive many touching letters from some of our soldiers and from the families of some of our soldiers, who understand what they are fighting for. They understand the importance of today's task in Vietnam in relation to America's continued freedom.

In closing, I would like to read a brief quotation from a young mother. I had lunch with her husband a year ago in December in Vietnam. He was a brilliant young officer, among the top of his West Point class, a Rhodes scholar, and one of the people that we had looked to for leadership in tomorrow's Army. He was killed by a sniper's bullet as he was accompanying a Vietnamese patrol in his area of responsibility. I wrote his widow, as I do the families of all of our people who die in Vietnam, and I received a reply from her. In this reply, she said:

"I now realize that the cost of freedom is

truly a terrible one, but I can assure you that one of my deepest beliefs is that our freedom must and shall prevail, whatever the cost."

These words show that our Nation's strength lies not in its things material. Our strength lies instead in the enduring dedication of our people to America's heritage, in our courage, in our willingness to sacrifice leisure, comfort, talents, even life itself, for the sake of our fellow men and our Nation's high purpose in the unfolding fabric of history.

Red's Long-Range Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious aspects of the South Vietnamese war is the manner in which Cambodia is assisting the Communist aggression in Vietnam. Cambodia, which has received hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayers' money in the form of aid, has betrayed our friendship and has virtually joined the camp of the Communist aggressors. For all too long there has been a reluctance among too many officials in this country to face up to the Cambodian problem and take the steps necessary to protect the lives of U.S. fighting men and our allies engaged in the Vietnamese war, and whose efforts are handicapped by Communist utilization of Cambodia.

Consequently, it was with considerable satisfaction that we learned of the recent report that our military commanders in South Vietnam have at least some limited authority to pursue Communist forces from Vietnam across the Cambodian border.

This situation is the subject of a very informative column by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, appearing in the South Bay Daily Breeze, Torrance, Calif., and in other papers served by the Copley News Service.

Because of the manner in which this column by the VFW national security director, General Hittle, explains the seriousness of Cambodia's assistance to Communist aggression, and specifically its effect upon the war in South Vietnam, I include the column at the conclusion of these remarks:

THE CHANGING SCENE: REDS' LONG-RANGE STRATEGY

(By James D. Hittle, brigadier general, USMC, retired)

WASHINGTON.—The decision to permit U.S. troops to pursue Communist units across the Cambodian border marks another critical step in the ever-widening war.

It is about as close as one can come to a jungle version of the seagoing "hot pursuit" doctrine. From now on when Communist forces are getting pummeled on the South Vietnamese side of the border, they won't be able to drift back and thus escape combat defeat.

But there is far more to the breaching of the Cambodian border sanctuary than the pursuit across it.

What we are seeing is the continued expansion of the conflict. It is another example of how artificial, and hence futile, it has been for us to try to restrict the scope of the war to an area smaller than what is actually involved in the Communist offensive.

Contrary to what the demonstrators and protesters are saying, this is not unilateral escalation by the United States. We and the South Vietnamese aren't turning a localized conflict into a larger one.

The reason is that the South Vietnamese war never really was a local one, neatly confined by issues and operations within the national borders.

The war in South Vietnam, as important as it is, is but a part of the overall Communist war of aggression in southeast Asia. We should have openly recognized long ago that we were involved in a southeast Asian war, not a South Vietnamese one.

Communism has marked all of the southeast Asian peninsula as a target and the Reds have conducted their offensive with deliberation.

The strategic groundwork has been astutely laid for the long-range offensive to seize the southeast Asian peninsula. A key aspect of the Red drive was the creation of the Laotian-Cambodian corridor. Red military action in Laos combined with Cambodian Prince Norodom Sihanouk's betrayal of U.S. friendship to give the Communists a central zone extending down the length of the southeast Asian peninsula from the Red Chinese border to the Gulf of Siam.

This Laotian-Cambodian corridor does many things. It splits the peninsula; it outflanks Burma from the northeast; it carries Red aggression to the borders of South Vietnam and Thailand. It provides the overland supply route—the Ho Chi Minh Trail—for carrying supplies southward from the Communist bases in North Vietnam and Red China.

Within the last few months the Communists have further disclosed their southeast Asian plans by bluntly announcing Thailand is next on their target list. Already Red terrorism is on the increase in the frontier areas of both Thailand and Malaysia.

All of this illustrates how the Communist general staffs look on the southeast Asian peninsula as a single arena. The current phase of Red aggression requires the seizure of South Vietnam and the expulsion of U.S. power from it. The reason: to clear their eastern flank. If they can do this, they can, with greater freedom of action, then turn southward against Thailand and Malaysia.

The decision to pursue across the Cambodian frontier is a partial recognition that we cannot restrict the conflict to the South Vietnam sector when the Reds are waging war throughout the peninsula.

Good Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

MR. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have complained of irresponsible coal operators who strip the countryside without properly replacing the soil. I was author of the bill calling for a study of strip-mined lands by the Secretary of the Interior, and I sponsored reclamation of mined areas on the public domain in the Appalachia bill.

Both the study and the reclamation work are going forward as planned, but

meanwhile mining companies which have always been good neighbors are continuing to provide forests, agricultural and grazing lands, and recreational areas in the regions which they mine.

There is another phase of coal mining requiring particular attention for the public welfare, and I am happy to report that four operators in western and central Pennsylvania have been complimented by Pennsylvania's Secretary of Mines for developing methods to handle acid mine discharges.

Dr. H. Beecher Charnbury last week paid special tribute to the following companies for their efforts in complying with the State's new clean streams laws: Bethlehem Steel Corp.; Barnes & Tucker, of Barnesboro; Rochester & Pittsburgh Coal Co., Indiana; and the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

These companies are good citizens. Other operators should make every effort to follow their example.

Vast Change in Greensburg in Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

MR. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

VAST CHANGE IN GREENSBURG IN DECADE

Greensburg is a different city than it was 10 years ago.

Residents of this community do not recognize how far reaching this transformation has been as much as former residents upon their return here.

The change has been gradual but significant.

Advent of new schools and new public works brought about the dawn of a new era here and in Decatur County as well.

In 1956, the principal industries were: Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp., Consolidated Veneer Corp., now Mitchell Industries, Inc., Cyclone Fence Co., and Dry Clime Lamp Co.

Bohn continues as one of this city's most valued industries with a high record of stable employment. Mitchell Industries, Inc., is approaching its 20th year of production in Greensburg, marked by steady employment and expansion.

A decade ago, Cyclone Fence Co. was singing its swan song as a Greensburg industry. Following termination of its operation here, the main building was purchased by Carol Cook, Inc., which in its dress operation employs more people than Cyclone in its heyday.

Other portions of the former Cyclone plant are now utilized by the Hanover Wire Cloth Division and Indiana Wire Products, both gaining in output.

A decade ago, Dry Clime was beginning to show its potential in its development as a leading firm in the infraray field. Its greatest progress has been made in the past 10 years.

The objective of the Greensburg Chamber of Commerce and the city administration a decade ago was to provide facilities which would make this city more attractive to industry.

Meanwhile, completion of Interstate 74 near this city in the early 1960's served as another stimulating factor.

The parade of industrial progress com-

menced in 1958, when Delta Faucet Co. announced its decision to locate a plant here for manufacture of Delta patented single-lever faucets. Not only has this company added to its floorspace three times but it has just completed a major expansion for use in plating, buffing, and polishing.

In 1959, the Randall Co., now a division of Textron, Inc., selected Greensburg for its first plant in Indiana. This operation has become of economic importance to this community.

On May 15, 1962, announcement was made that Bearings Co. of America a division of the present Federal-Mogul Corp., would construct an industrial facility in Greensburg for the manufacture of ball bearings. Acclaimed as the most modern bearings plant in America, BCA began operations here in the early summer of 1963. In 1965, the company installed new equipment and increased its employed personnel by a third.

Providing diversification in industry have been two new industries, which located in Greensburg in 1963 and 1964. The first of these, Crown Zellerbach Corp., produces plastic film bags for many uses. Crown Zellerbach is installing additional machinery, which in the near future will mean expanded employment.

Rafco Plastics Division of Gulf Oil Corp. located here in 1964 and began production of polyethylene film late in that year. Currently, Rafco Plastics Division has started a new addition in order to gain more space for its operations and for warehousing in serving Midwestern markets.

Both Crown Zellerbach and Rafco Plastics have considerably exceeded initial estimates of employment at the time their plants were opened in Greensburg.

In addition, Greensburg has several smaller industrial operations, which contribute to the economy of this community.

Circulation of the Greensburg Daily News has increased from 5,009 in 1958 to 5,775 in 1966. Now in its third year is WTRE-FM, which plans to buy property near Greensburg for future expansion. Another operation, Decatur County REMC, has acquired land west of the city. Two new shopping centers have been opened.

Various utilities have expanded their operations during the past 10 years. Public Telephone Corp. has installed a dial system, provided for direct dialing and now uses a microwave tower. The Decatur County Rural Water Corp. was formed in 1965. The Greensburg Municipal Water Works has expanded its system.

In 1956, Edgewood Acres was the principal subdivision, adjacent to Greensburg. Not only has Edgewood Acres been expanded but over a half dozen new subdivisions have become the site of new homes.

Development of Lake Santee is becoming the equivalent in economic value to a new industry in Decatur County.

Expansion in several Decatur County communities has occurred in the past decade, notably at Westport and St. Paul.

Development of industry has brought new families to this community. Key figures in the new industries have become active in the life of this community.

The change in the past decade has brought to this community a balance between agriculture and industry. In the field of agriculture, new peaks were registered in 1965. Livestock prices have turned upward, benefiting the economy of Decatur County.

A decade ago, youths from farms had to seek employment in larger centers. Now, many of them are finding employment opportunity in their home community.

There have been many other evidences of change: new rental establishments; remodeling of store fronts and interiors; new street illumination downtown; peak deposits in banks and savings and loan associations; improvements by fraternal groups; expansion of recreational facilities; improved municipi-

February 3, 1966

A506

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

pal facilities; and numerous other types of developments.

The past decade in Greensburg and Decatur County can be characterized as a period of remarkable progress.

Subterfuge Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting and illuminating editorial appeared in last week's issue of the Sturgis (S. Dak.) Tribune, entitled "Subterfuge Spending," which certainly is food for thought for every Member of Congress who last year voted for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and who must certainly be interested now in how it is being administered.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the RECORD and suggest that every Member read it. It follows:

SUBTERFUGE SPENDING

We listened to an explanation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act enacted by Congress last year at the annual Meade County school officers' meeting here Monday, and left the meeting in a state of shock. We suspect a lot of the school board members did too.

The speaker was a representative of the State department of public instruction who has been assigned the task of coordinating implementation of the Federal act in South Dakota. He disclosed that South Dakota is eligible for a Federal grant of \$7 million under this act and he pointed out the funds will be allocated in other States if not utilized here.

He candidly reminded that, whether or not the school board members approve of this new Federal program, the money is going to be spent somewhere and South Dakota districts might just as well take advantage of the funds allocated to this State. It was not this "use it or lose it" attitude that shocked us, however, as we have become conditioned to this philosophy of public spending. We are reluctant to accept the wisdom of this philosophy, but we think it must be conceded that the general public has accepted it.

What shocked us was his explanation of the intent of the act and how it is being interpreted to make Federal funds available to virtually every school district in the land, whether they need them or not. The act, he explained, was designed to finance the schooling of educationally deprived children and the funds allocated under it cannot be used for general education purposes.

He pointed out the Federal funds are available only for specific projects outside the scope of general education that are oriented toward helping the educationally deprived child. These projects, he added, must cost a minimum of \$2,000 to even be considered. However, he said two or more districts may join together in providing these new school projects.

But what is an "educationally deprived child"? Under strict interpretation of the act, he explained, it means a child coming from a family of less than \$3,000 per year income. Now, public education in South Dakota, and we assume elsewhere, is not offered on a financially segregated basis. The student from the poorest family gets the same educational opportunities as the

student from the wealthiest family in our public school system. The act was obviously geared for urban centers where pockets of poverty can be easily identified.

It became apparent some months ago that a more liberal interpretation of the act's provisions was necessary if South Dakota and other States like it are to share in this massive Federal aid to education program. So the Federal funds were allocated to the districts on the basis of the percentage of students each of them are estimated to have of the total number of families in the State with incomes under \$3,000 per year counted in the last Federal census.

The fact that each district is assumed to have some students from low-income families automatically qualifies it for a share of the county's allocation. However, specific projects not already in the school program are required for release of the Federal funds. A district may inaugurate more than one new project, depending on its needs, but each project is evaluated independently on its merits.

Under this formula, Sturgis Independent School District No. 12 qualified for \$27,000 of the \$72,000 allocated under the act to Meade County. The Government, based on the last census, estimates there are 335 "educationally deprived" children in Meade County. The Sturgis district is using most of its allocation for the new kindergarten project. It plans to use the remainder on summer remedial projects. Now, of course, the kindergarten program here is open to all youngsters of the qualified age, regardless of the income status of their parents. The summer remedial programs will be too.

The real shocker at Monday's meeting came when the speaker explained the expanded definition of an "educationally deprived" child as determined in conferences between State and Federal officials. "Every school has some children that aren't doing as well as other children," he commented, "and the Federal funds can be used on projects to help them." In other words, under this compromise definition, a poor student is also "educationally deprived." This, apparently, is justification for use of the Federal funds in financing summer school remedial programs. But a "poor student" is not necessarily a student from a poor family.

The speaker disclosed the Federal funds can even be used to finance the training of teachers for special remedial courses. He added that most applications for project approval in the State so far have come from the independent districts. But he reported there are many possibilities for the common school districts to qualify for the funds allotted to them too. We certainly agree with him there. And, like the man said, if these districts don't dream up qualified projects, the money will be shifted to districts in other States that do.

The new Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been heralded as a great boon to the educationally deprived. It is subterfuge, however, to contend that the act is being implemented only to help students from poverty-income families. It is, actually, being used to provide additional courses open to all students. It is merely assumed that some of the students will be from poverty-income families or will be poor students in the academic sense. This is not to say that these additional courses are not beneficial or worthwhile. But it shows how the act has been interpreted to pump Federal funds into all school districts that enlarge their curriculums.

The speaker at Monday's meeting preferred not to comment on the question of whether or not the Federal funds will lead to Federal control of the schools. He opined that it is too early to tell and added that there are many differences of opinion on the question. He conceded, however, that there is much red tape connected with gaining approval of

projects qualifying for the Federal funds. But there is little doubt that the act has been liberally interpreted to make it possible for all districts to qualify for the Federal money.

It would have been far better, in our opinion, if the Government had turned the \$7 million over to the South Dakota school districts without any strings attached. We have no doubt that the districts would have put the money to good use. It would have avoided the need for subterfuge and eliminated a lot of unwieldy administrative procedures.

Where Are the Protests Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the voices of protest within our country against the American position in Vietnam have been sobered and silenced, to a large degree, by the ominous Communist rebuff to President Johnson's peace overtures.

Those voices which earlier were lambasting the administration for what they felt was its passive pursuit of peace should now, in all fairness, be blasting the enemy for its refusal to embrace the peace overtures. But, unfortunately, they are rather strangely silent, as the following editorial from the Deseret News of January 29, 1966, points out.

The Communists' rejection of our peace bid adds a rather ominous dimension to the belligerence that the Red Chinese have been showing for many years. It is reminiscent of Hitler's attitude 30 years ago.

The defense of South Vietnamese people against the vastly superior aggressor has become a grim and distasteful business, as was the prospect of standing up to Hitler in Czechoslovakia and Austria. But history teaches that, from our failure to face that challenge, far bloodier consequences followed.

The Deseret News editorial, "Where Are the Protests Now?" raises some questions that the critics of our Vietnam policy, and for that matter, all Americans should be asking themselves. I ask my colleagues to study the editorial in full:

WHERE ARE THE PROTESTS Now?

As President Johnson and his advisers weigh the agonizing decision whether or not to resume bombings in North Vietnam, has anyone noticed a thunderous silence?

What has happened to the voices of the professors and the artists and the students and the draft card burners who were so loudly demanding peace?

For the past month and more, the administration has engaged in a most energetic campaign for peace. It has sent its representatives to capitals throughout the world where there has been any chance of meaningful progress being made. The President has proclaimed his readiness to talk peace at any time, without prior conditions or other qualifications. Other world leaders have added their voices for peace.

No one can doubt the sincerity of the effort. It has been accompanied by a morato-

Appendix

Be Still and Know That I Am God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, gave the sermon at St. John's Church—Episcopal—in Georgetown at the Annual Church and Government Sunday. He spoke with eloquence and deep feeling of need for people in today's world to better understand their God. So that more people will have an opportunity to read these important remarks I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT, ANNUAL CHURCH AND GOVERNMENT SUNDAY, JANUARY 9, 1966, AT THE ST. JOHN'S CHURCH (EPISCOPAL), GEORGETOWN, WASHINGTON, D.C.

"What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?" Psalms 8, verse 4. "Thou makest him to have dominion of the works of Thy hands." Verse 6.

Confronted by the incredible advances of the modern world, has the inner nature of man been affected, and if so, in what way? The discoveries within a single century have surely altered the course of man's progress more than the sum total of all the term of man's prior existence on this earth.

What of man against the machine? How has he fared? The machine drastically alters the course of man, speeds up his timetable a hundredfold, even a thousandfold and, in space opens a new dimension to be conquered. What of the effect upon man's relationship to God?

Automation may be defined as the substitution by machines for the physical strength of man. Cybernetics may be described as the substitution by machines for the mental operations of man.

Some of you may have read recently the somewhat irreverent story told by technicians about computers. The story goes that a huge computer was fed this question: "Is there a God?" The computer whirred, buzzed and finally read out: "Now there is."

Well, the most deeply thoughtful explorers of the nature of the universe find, of course, that the more they learn, the more there is to learn. The deeper they probe, the more likely they are to find that the acceptance of God, the Creator, is essential to the verity of their theorizing.

Einstein caused the world to know the meaning of $E = MC^2$, but behind this equation of destruction, beyond the discovery of a key to unleash the powers of the earth and the air, lies the creative, all-knowing force which is God.

Men have believed (as the ancients thought) that Heaven is upon some mountain top, or beyond the sky or at the farthest reaches of the stars. Though men

have dispatched their minds to search in the far places, the longest journey cannot but bring one back to the simplest truth: that God is surely to be found within each human heart.

Let us return to man and the machine: servant or master? It is true that automation and cybernetics bring with them deprivations and dislocations. They may, and do, reduce employment, especially in the areas of their original impact. In time, more employment is created, more leisure is made possible for the employee. Leisure, wisely used, can open new worlds, heretofore unsavored.

Automation, the machine, is not superior to man. It does not supplant man in the scheme of nature any more than the secular church can, in this aspect, supplant the spiritual church. The good works of automation may serve to free the individual to provide more time to adjust more agreeably to a widened vista, perhaps even to give more thought to his meaning as man. The good works of the secular church bring religion into involvement with the problems of modern living. As we have just read in Psalm 72: "He shall defend the children of the poor." The spiritual commitment of the church impels it still to minister to the souls of men.

A more automated community need never be a less spiritual community, as is well exemplified in the computerized atomic energy communities in New Mexico and Tennessee. For it is eternally true that there is no machine to replace those inner fires of inspiration, to create the indispensable ideas which only men can feed to the machines.

No cybernetic formulas to simplify with computers the intricate problems of men in space can ever put men in orbit until after other human beings have conceived within themselves, and then pursued, the challenges offered by the unexplored.

However much the Sunday supplement writers may dwell on the so-called illimitable potential of the machine, that power is always limited, always finite. For the machine is, and must ever be, the servant of man, for good or ill. The power for good is illimitable if "the spirit of man that is in him, to the light of the vision wakes." Not all of the computers in the world, nor all of the mathematical equations of cybernetics can create that vision, nor can any manmade thing, without the guidance of man, bring an idea to life.

From whence, then, comes "the light of the vision"? This is no vision fabricated of metals, plastics or electricity. Nor is man alone, within himself, capable of the wonders which man has wrought. Many of you are familiar with the glorious ceiling in the Sistine Chapel, painted by Michelangelo, so surely illuminated with his own inner vision. There one sees—and feels—the hand of man reaching, straining to its uttermost, to touch the hand of God, to receive from the Almighty the gift of life.

"The light of the vision" is a gift from the hand of God.

Men today through prayer, communion, dedication, zeal or devout determination, summon up inner resources when they touch the hand of God. Inner fires are set afame, to conquer the mysteries of the unknown, to light the way of the future. In harmony with God's purpose, he may give life, as the poet Goethe did. Consider the power poten-

tial, to use modern terms, of these two thoughts which Goethe has left with us:

"Nothing is more terrible than ignorance in action," and

"That which we have inherited from our forefathers, we must earn again, in order to deserve."

So, imperishable ideas are flung, like torches, to be retrieved and carried aloft by others, from day to uncountable day.

How wise are they who know that these things they have done are not of their own human doing. There is the cry of one who made possible our now commonplace telephone, when he viewed its success: "What hath God wrought."

No one will claim that any electronic device has ever been sparked by the touch of God's hand. But every single thing which goes into that complicated engineering marvel has been conceived by men who, without inspiration, which is the heritage of God's challenge to man, would have been as powerless to start themselves as are the machines.

In all of our "still achieving, still pursuing," amidst the tumult of this modern busy world, let us never forget that there is a voice to be heard, a voice which is not our voice, yet mindful of us, informing us all, commanding us all:

"Be still—and know that I am God."

IUE To Raise Dollars To Construct Vietnam Refugee Resettlement Village

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of pride that I call attention to a project of my union, the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Works, AFL-CIO, to help the innocent victims of the Vietnam conflict rebuild their lives. Under a resolution adopted by the IUE Executive Board on December 8, 1965, a campaign has been launched to obtain a dollar from each member to construct a refugee resettlement village in South Vietnam to assist displaced families and orphans in shaping a better, more productive future. Recognizing that peace with freedom is impossible while people are hungry, homeless, and jobless, the IUE has, in characteristic fashion, taken constructive, positive action to help win the peace and the people. Knowing my fellow IUE members' spirit of brotherhood and compassion, I am confident of the success of this laudable people-to-people, union-to-union program.

The underlying hope of these good Americans who are contributing their dollars and good will to the victims of

A492

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—APPENDIX

February 3, 1966

war was summarized in an editorial in the IUE News of December 23, 1965:

And yet, if IUE succeeds in the village, and others can find their way of helping, and governments can tackle the big picture in time, perhaps we can prevent another Vietnam from plaguing the earth.

The details of the project are contained in the following articles that appeared in the December 23 and January 6 issues of the IUE News:

[From the IUE News, Dec. 23, 1965]

IUE TO RAISE DOLLARS TO CONSTRUCT VIETNAM REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT VILLAGE

To aid the innocent victims of the war in Vietnam, the IUE Executive Board, by unanimous vote, has initiated a subscription campaign of \$1 per member. The action stems from a resolution, adopted at the December 11 meeting in San Francisco, expressing support of President Johnson's policy on Vietnam.

Moving quickly to implement the resolution—which was adopted after a long and thorough discussion—IUE National and International Affairs Director Al Loewenthal, acting under the direction of President Jennings, met with representatives of the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development to ascertain needs in order to develop a meaningful program.

Among those consulted were three Government officials who also carry IUE membership cards: Howard Robinson, State Department labor adviser for Far Eastern affairs; John Dillon, chief of program coordination of AID's office of labor affairs; Emil Lindahl, AID labor technical officer, now working in Vietnam.

Others who were consulted by Loewenthal were George Goss, AID Vietnam Relief Coordinator, and Paul Schuler, acting Far East labor adviser for AID.

As a result of these consultations, IUE has undertaken to raise a dollar from each member to establish a refugee resettlement village in South Vietnam working together with the Vietnamese labor movement (CVT) and AID.

The IEB originally contemplated a children's village for orphans, but Vietnamese labor leaders and AID officials in Vietnam informed the union that a refugee resettlement village would fill a greater need by bringing orphans together with families and by helping all displaced civilians help themselves to build new lives.

According to surveys made for President Johnson by a seven-man team of voluntary agency representatives last month, "The number of refugees in Vietnam will in all probability increase by the end of 1965 to something in the magnitude of 1 million persons."

In an article, prepared for the New York Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk declared, "President Johnson has asked for greater public support of our voluntary agencies in Vietnam and increased participation by free world nations. What is being done is being done well but the needs are so great they cannot be met by our present effort. That effort must be tremendously increased if we are to win the peace and win the people."

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY recently said, "The opportunity is to transform the refugees from a national liability to a national asset—to seize this opportunity to help the displaced people of Vietnam help themselves to a more secure and productive life through Government-sponsored programs of resettlement, vocational training, agricultural training, and technical assistance in the fields of health, education, public works, and public safety."

The United States is supporting these refugee relief and rehabilitation programs of the Government of Vietnam with all the applicable resources at its disposal—AID,

U.S. voluntary agencies, and U.S. military materials and personnel."

A call for more voluntary agencies to join in "a great international effort to help the people of South Vietnam" in civic action programs was issued earlier this month by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees. He emphasized the great need for "refugee aid programs."

The resolution of the IUE executive board expressed the union's support "of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam to establish peace with freedom."

It cited President Johnson's April 7, 1965 speech at Johns Hopkins University in which he offered to enter into "unconditional negotiations" and pledged to meet the basic problems of human suffering and impoverishment by asking Congress for a \$1 billion investment to aid the economic development of southeast Asia.

"The President has clearly extended the offer of peace and though rebuffed many times his offer remains the core of American policy," the board resolution declared.

"Until Hanoi agrees to come to a conference and negotiate a settlement, there is no alternative other than that American diplomacy and military involvement be carried on vigorously and continuously to bring them to the bargaining table.

"We must convince the Communists that their error is both military and political and that their stubborn refusal to recognize reality by the prolongation of hostilities is inflicting misery beyond toleration upon the people of Vietnam. We must make clear that their resistance to unconditional negotiations strengthens each day our determination to achieve a just and lasting peace."

The IUE Board pledged "full backing to our fellow countrymen who are charged with the delicate and dangerous military tasks of carrying out American policy in Vietnam" as well as to "the innocent victims of that conflict."

In addition to the \$1 a member subscription campaign for the refugee resettlement village, the board endorsed campaigns for CARE and USO "to express our regard for the military personnel on active duty there."

[From the IUE News, Jan. 6, 1966]
TO WIN THE PEACE AND THE PEOPLE IN VIETNAM—THE IUE HELPS

Fleeing from the terrorism of the Vietcong and the increasing scale of military action, some 1 million persons have left their homes and sources of livelihood to seek refuge in areas controlled by United States and South Vietnamese forces. They are mostly women and children and old folks. After 25 years of war, they are a tired, disillusioned and skeptical people. According to a team of U.S. voluntary agency representatives who went to South Vietnam to look at the problem last October, the refugees "will have to be convinced over a period of time before they genuinely resettle in reasonably normal pursuits on their own."

Last month the IUE International Executive Board also took a look at the Vietnam situation and voted unanimously to support President Johnson's policy. At the same time, in recognition "of the suffering inflicted upon the people of Vietnam, most particularly upon the innocent victims of that conflict," the IUE Board decided to help. After consulting with the Vietnamese Confederation of Labor (CVT) and the United States Agency for International Development (AID), President Jennings announced IUE's help would be the raising of voluntary dollars to build a refugee resettlement village in South Vietnam.

Vietnamese labor leaders suggested the village based on knowledge of the needs of the refugees, and the CVT will be a full partner

in the program, according to IUE International Affairs Director Al Loewenthal.

Why should an IUE member give a dollar to help build a village of homes and farms and jobs for Vietnamese refugees they have never seen? For some it is because we must win the people as well as the peace in South Vietnam to prevent the Communists from controlling all of southeast Asia. For others, it is because children and women and old folks are crying out for help so that they can help themselves.

Whatever your reason, the need exists and your dollar can help. Won't you be one of those who care enough to give? Checks should be made payable to: IUE Refugee Resettlement Village in South Vietnam, and sent to IUE National and International Affairs Department, 1126 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

Custer County's Pioneer Dr. McArthur Foresaw Future Greatness

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

**HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA**

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, 60 years ago this week, the Custer County Chief, published in Broken Bow, Nebr., conducted a contest for the best article written on Custer County.

The prize was a leather-bound edition of the collected works of Alexander Pope. It was won by a young physician named Dr. A. J. McArthur who, in a real sense, was a pioneer doctor on the Nebraska prairie.

The volume was inscribed to Dr. McArthur by the "Purcell Bros., Publishers, the Chief." It is of interest, Mr. President, that the Purcell family, represented now by Mr. Harry C. Purcell, is still editing and publishing the Custer County Chief.

Dr. McArthur died in 1942, but on this 60th anniversary of his prize-winning essay, it is appropriate to think back to that time and to consider his predictions, hopes, and aspirations for the area he loved so well.

Dr. McArthur graduated in 1891 from the St. Louis School of Medicine, now the medical school of the Washington University in St. Louis, Mo. As a young man, he came to Custer County and settled on a farm outside the city of Broken Bow. There he raised 12 children and established his medical practice, a practice that took him great distances in this county with its 2,600 square miles of area.

He was one of two country physicians who traveled the wide expanse of this sprawling county in a horse and buggy. As he traveled through Custer County, he grew familiar with the general topography of the area which at that time was not completely cultivated or settled. Dr. McArthur envisioned bountiful harvests and a long and productive future for the rolling grasslands, fine winter ranges for cattle, and plenty of water.

It is interesting to note that the predictions of this leading citizen came to

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2001

Health and food services: Medical examinations, dental checkups, eyeglasses for children who can't afford them, nursing services, school breakfasts, and lunches to supplement inadequate diets.

Guidance and counseling services: Employment of guidance counselors, psychologists, psychologists or psychiatrists (often part-time or on a shared basis with neighboring school districts), social workers, home-school visitors; extension of guidance and counseling services to the junior high, or even elementary, level.

Teacher in-service training: Seminars on teaching disadvantaged children, understanding their culture, dealing with their parents; observation of master teachers or remedial specialists in the laboratory situation; workshops, conducted by an institution of higher learning on Saturdays or during the summer, in connection with a specific title I project.

Recreation: Perhaps an activity of low priority, but in a balanced program, it could have a place; such activities might constitute a part of a summer educational camp or might be combined with health services in areas where physical needs have been neglected.

Cooperative projects seem particularly desirable for districts with small entitlements. As one school official in the Southwest remarked: "What can we do with \$237?" In any such situation, joint ventures are virtually necessary to achieve a program with scope and substance—in short, to get the most bang for the buck. Oklahomas is considering the approval of a rebuilt bus (\$37,000) that would rotate among a number of rural school districts to provide remedial reading services. Similar mobile units could be used to provide health, guidance, or library services.

Because of the late date of the appropriation measure and subsequent delay of project materials, we realize that many school districts found it difficult to implement programs during the first half of the school year. If, because of existing commitments, adequate personnel are not available to staff projects for the second term, summer programs might be ideal—remedial classes, enrichment activities, preschool projects, day camps, full-time summer school programs, etc. Schools may wish to combine the advantages of an academic program with the play aspects of a summer session, gearing remedial classes to craft and creative activities.

An enrichment remedial recreation combination is hard to beat. In fact, summer school programs have the twin advantage of using uncommitted resources and providing opportunity to plan effective programs that have special merit for children who would otherwise lapse completely into a barren home environment.

If a local district does not have sufficient resources within the school system, it may wish to draw on the resources of outside groups—Federal Extension Service agents and home economists of the Department of Agriculture, OEO personnel, church volunteers, women's groups, civic organizations. For instance, if a school district needs to improve its library program but cannot secure sufficient staff of supplies, it may contract with the public library system to mobilize the necessary resources.

The following projects have been initiated by school districts in the past, not necessarily under title I, and have been highlighted in "Education: An Answer to Poverty, School Programs for the Disadvantaged" (a revision of Educational Research Service Circular No. 2), or the December issue of School Management.

A small Midwestern city has made a concentrated effort to encourage parental interest in an enrichment program for the

primary grades. For its kindergarten program it conducted extensive interviews with parents to help form an approximate record of the experience each child had gleaned from his home and neighborhood environment. Moreover, a community counseling program has been instituted and social workers offer to help with problems that might affect a child's success in school—budget, nutrition, atmosphere for study.

A Michigan preschool also cultivates parental interest. Teachers make home visits every afternoon, ostensibly to report to parents on a child's progress. But the visit is mostly taken up with engaging the mother, the preschool pupil, and other brothers and sisters in games and storytelling, thus encouraging the delighted mother to become a preschool teacher in her own home.

In an Ohio city an ingenious, and extremely inexpensive, preschool kit is helping disadvantaged youngsters and their mothers get ready for the first grade. Three hundred women produced over 3,000 preschool kits at a cost of 50 cents per child—plain denim bags filled with 15-cent packages of clay, pipe cleaners, crayons, paste, pads of paper, shoe-laces, erasers, storybooks, coloring books, homemade dolls, beanbags, pencils, paper clips, shelf paper and other items.

In the summer, mothers were invited to attend preschool demonstration meetings where volunteers showed mothers how to make a game out of teaching their children how to brush their teeth, how to cut the tops off an old pair of sneakers, staple them to cardboard and teach children how to play "ties your shoes." Mothers added items to the bags themselves—thread, spoons, zippers—anything their child's imagination could pursue. The same city also instituted a tutor corps of 1,600 outstanding high school students who coach 4,000 elementary students in 60 locations throughout the inner city—in libraries, YMCA's, recreation centers, churches, settlement houses, and schools.

A school in Maryland has instituted a program to test newly enrolled first graders for reading readiness. Children without adequate preschool experience are now placed in classes of no more than 20 pupils. Children in one southern school who are behind in auditory and language development—and who without special help would remain behind—are given special training in listening and speech production by a speech therapist.

A California district designed a summer program for migrant children involving field trips, medical examinations, films on good health habits, remedial instruction, and group work in various subject areas.

Programmed instruction on teaching machines—an ever-increasing practice—has been found to be effective with disadvantaged children, perhaps because the pupil is doing something to make the machine work and the machine rapidly presents him with something new to do—in short, he learns how to learn. But no amount of "hardware" can replace a competent instructor or a well-designed curriculum.

One Maryland community has established evening counseling services in the city library for students over 16 years of age who have dropped out of school. Paid community service can also be a prime tool for influencing dropouts to resume school work. Some localities have developed impressive programs of combining youth employment with resumed schooling, future job training, and counseling. To deter potential dropouts from leaving school, a work-study project might provide for jobs in hospitals, libraries and day-care centers—services that would accomplish the triple purpose of vocational training, community betterment, and academic incentive.

An Illinois county has tried to stem dropouts by creating part-time jobs—teacher aids, playground attendants, office assistants,

library helpers, landscape and laboratory assistants.

One after-school study center is run on Saturday mornings by a minister's wife and 30 volunteers, mostly high school seniors. A library is stocked by the public library system. A similar project could be instituted under title I, perhaps in cooperation with title II library resources. Needy high school students might be hired as homework helpers. For that matter, pilot experiments in Michigan and California have indicated a noticeable rise in involvement and achievement of young children who were tutored by sixth-grade students—not to mention a beneficial change in the achievement and attitude of the tutors themselves.

As part of a \$320,000 approved title I project from Texas, \$12,000 is being set aside for food services and \$28,000 for clothing, medical and dental help. The superintendent remarked that the success of remedial activities depends greatly on the effectiveness of community-oriented activities.

One proposed project from Georgia calls for a psychologist or psychiatrist to spend 24 days a year working in the district on a consultant basis. (The nearest psychologist is 50 miles away and funds do not permit a full-time man.) In the same area, a qualified reading consultant would be hired to plan a developmental reading program for disadvantaged students. Part of his duties would include the development of an inservice training course for teachers to stress diagnosing reading problems and employing effective classroom techniques (the district can't afford highly trained specialists and has hired 18 extra teachers for remedial classes).

In California, Project TNT (training natural talent) would provide an invigorated school program for academically able junior high students handicapped by poor primary backgrounds. This proposed extension of an ongoing project would involve special grouping, intensive counseling, special individualized projects, 24-hour-a-day access to library materials, cultural activities, and special summer sessions—all designed to encourage college entrance, to win family confidence, and, ultimately, to upgrade programs in all deprived areas—and all costing \$6,000.

Mentally retarded teenagers have been encouraged to become self-reliant in one Pacific coast project costing only \$10,000. They have been taught some very fundamental, but necessary, tasks: how to cash a check, pay a bill, mail a package, apply for a job. These interpersonal relationships are staged in the classroom and then practiced in the community.

In an upstate New York community, adult volunteers act as classroom troubleshooters to help teachers spot specific student problems—at a mere cost of \$2,500.

As part of one great cities project, special service schools in economically and educationally deprived areas are provided with smaller classes than in regular schools, specialized programs in reading and mathematics, additional teaching personnel for corrective reading or guidance, and larger-than-average allotments for textbooks and supplies.

To give a brief rundown of some project applications already received in the Division of Program Operations that outline activities and services involving relatively small costs:

New Mexico: Preschool English program for 15 non-English-speaking children, \$6,956.17.

Connecticut: Quality improvement in math, reading, and English, \$13,902.

Maine: Operation Cultural Uplift (teacher aid, record players, partitions), \$3,789.

Minnesota: Speech therapy, \$6,555.69.

Arkansas: Remedial reading and breakfast supplement, \$10,877.

Florida: After school study periods, \$8,376.

Indiana: Teacher aids, \$12,000.

2002

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- HOUSE

February 3, 1966

Arizona: Special education for mentally retarded, \$31,692.

In your position at the State level, you occupy a pivotal role. Many local school districts will need and seek your advice as to the thrust of their title I program. You can give them guidance, suggestions, and technical assistance as to project design. The above activities and services by no means exhaust the list of possible title I projects. We are sure that you can add case studies of your own and, in so doing, perform a valuable service to your local school districts in their task of meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

PRIVATE INITIATIVE AND THE RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in his housing message the President cited the dramatic and positive response to the rent supplement program from private groups throughout the country. In the short time since the last session of the Congress adjourned, without acting on the administration's request for funds to implement the program, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has already received preliminary proposals from sponsors to construct nearly 70,000 low-income units under the rent supplement program as soon as funds become available.

The President reported to us that this overwhelming expression of interest in the program had come from nearly every State in the Union and from 265 localities. He said about half of the requests had come from charitable and nonprofit groups.

While this is impressive, it comes as no surprise to me. In my own State of New York I have been gratified to observe in recent years a great upsurge in the number of private groups sincerely concerned with the plight of slum dwellers and deeply committed and dedicated to intense efforts to help these people improve themselves socially and economically and, at the same time, to help them bring up to decent standards the houses and neighborhoods in which they live. This great outpouring of social concern and the desire to take action and to make sacrifices in behalf of our less-privileged fellow citizens is in the great tradition of America. Just as we, as a nation, have demonstrated our desire to help the underprivileged in the less-developed countries of the world, Americans everywhere are becoming concerned with the underprivileged portion of our own great society. For ironically, we do not have to travel halfway around the world to discover poverty, deprivation, and human despair. It is to be found in abundance in the slums of most of our cities and towns.

This concern for our less fortunate neighbors is being manifested by ministers, priests, and rabbis—by fraternal organizations, by neighborhood improvement associations, by nonprofit organizations supported by civic and business

leaders, and by a host of other groups of high motive and noble purpose.

Not only in my own State but in every part of the country, there is a great and swelling movement of private charity: spontaneous, informal, intensely local. It is a tribute to and a reflection of the qualities which have made America great.

It is most reassuring, that these groups have responded so quickly to the promise of the rent supplement program. This program is well designed to assist them in carrying out the noble purposes of human and neighborhood improvement to which they are dedicating so much of their effort. In a sense, the rent supplement program was made to order for their purposes—and they have been quick to recognize it.

The rent supplement program will make it possible for them to help poor people in poor neighborhoods to bring their living conditions up to a decent standard. This, combined with the social services and human counseling which they are so uniquely equipped to provide, represents an unparalleled opportunity for private groups to eliminate substandard living conditions, a social maladjustment, lack of opportunity and hope—which are the deepest causes of the disease which threatens the very fabric of our urban society.

I think we owe it to these many private nonprofit groups to give them the tools they need to accomplish the inspiring job of social reconstruction they are so eager to undertake. They have made it very clear that they consider the rent supplement program one of the tools they need the most.

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MULTER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

VN

THE PRESIDENT DECIDES

(Mr. McGRATH (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, the Philadelphia Inquirer carried a thoroughly interesting editorial discussion of the President's role in reaching decisions.

Beyond this theme, the Inquirer also demonstrated great clarity of foresight and accuracy of predictability.

On that day—2 days before President Johnson announced our resumption of bombing in North Vietnam—the Inquirer declared:

President Johnson has sought and obtained expert counsel on every facet of the issues facing him in Vietnam. He has analyzed the results of the bombing lull and his peace offensive. When he is as sure as any human being can be that what he intends to do is in the best interests of our country—he will do it. And, when he does, he deserves, and we are sure that he will receive, the whole-

hearted support of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Since the appearance of that editorial, the Communists of Hanoi and Peiping have been shown in no uncertain terms that we do not intend to lessen our resistance to the beleaguered people of South Vietnam. We do not intend to pull back from our commitment to the cause of freedom in that troubled place.

And I believe that the Inquirer was absolutely correct in its prediction that the President will have the support of the great majority of our people.

So that my colleagues may have the opportunity to read this frank editorial, I am submitting it for printing in the RECORD at this point:

THE PRESIDENT DECIDES

"The buck," read a sign on President Truman's desk in the White House, "stops here."

When the chips are down, when the final judgment has to be made—whether the issue is freedom for the slaves, the missile confrontation with Soviet Russia in Cuba, or the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam—it is the President who has the decisive word.

The loneliness and the agonizing responsibility that go with his office must have been brought home to the present occupant of the White House to an excruciating degree as he has wrestled with the problems wrapped up in the bombing of North Vietnam.

Whatever conclusion is reached, the responsibility will rest on Lyndon B. Johnson—and not on a single one of the individuals who have been pressuring him, hammering at him, and pulling and pushing him in every direction since the bombing pause began on Christmas Eve.

Very few of these self-appointed advisers have more than second- or third-hand knowledge of the issues. Most of them merely parrot what someone else has said, on the frailest authority. Yet they all but push intimidating fingers into the President's face to urge him to give up the bombing indefinitely, to pulverize Hanoi, or to adopt some other strategy.

It is easy to be a Monday morning quarterback, when you're not held responsible for mistakes. It is easy for Congressmen to pose as cloakroom Napoleons, when they can shift as the winds blow—belligerent yesterday, pacifist tomorrow, and comatose in between.

Some of those who have been pressuring the President the most are outright appeasers who want the United States to run out of Vietnam at once, and who will never be satisfied with anything less.

President Johnson has sought and obtained expert counsel on every facet of the issues facing him in Vietnam. He has analyzed the results of the bombing lull and his peace offensive. When he is as sure as any human being can be that what he intends to do is in the best interests of our country—he will do it. And, when he does, he deserves, and we are sure that he will receive, the wholehearted support of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

VN THE WRONG QUESTIONS

(Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in concise, clear language, the

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2003

Wall Street Journal in a recent editorial carefully noted that the administration weighed both military and diplomatic consideration before unleashing more airpower over North Vietnam.

The military variable was, in President Johnson's words, the "cost in lives—Vietnamese, American and allied"—which would result from continued immunity for the Vietcong's logistical operation in the north.

The diplomatic question was whether a continued pause in air strikes might bring negotiations; but again, as the President said, "it is plain that there is no readiness to talk—no readiness for peace—in that regime today."

The Journal pointed out:

While nearly everyone dreads the prospect of a larger war, history gives scant support to the notion that endlessly yielding a bit to ambitious powers will prevent larger wars by stilling their ambitions.

This, in clear words, is what Americans already know—and must never forget.

The continuing struggle to stop aggression and to prevent the Communists from upsetting the fragile balance of power through force or the use of force must—and will—go on.

As a clearly stated reminder of the path we are determinedly set to follow, this article from the Wall Street Journal is offered for the RECORD at this point:

THE WRONG QUESTIONS

The resumption of U.S. bombings in North Vietnam comes on the heels of an open-session bombardment of United States Asian policy by a faction of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The question of the bombings, indeed, illustrates a lot about the larger issues the committee members broached.

In deciding to unleash airpower over North Vietnam, the administration was obviously forced to weigh both military and diplomatic considerations. As President Johnson's speech to the Nation yesterday indicated, the military variable was the "cost in lives—Vietnamese, American, and allied"—which would result from continued immunity for the Vietcong's logistical foundation in the north.

The diplomatic question, of course, was whether a continued pause might make North Vietnam willing to negotiate something other than an American capitulation. The answer is now clearer than ever. As the President said, "It is plain that there is no readiness to talk—no readiness for peace—in that regime today."

Some, we suppose, will strongly object to the President's decision. But any harsh protest will reveal a blindness—which the man who bears responsibility for soldiers' lives cannot afford—to the military side of the equation. Similarly, in public discussion during the pause, talk about diplomacy nearly obscured the military issue. This was true even though there was room for questioning military calculations of the bombing's effectiveness.

For the most part, similar misdirection has prevailed in public discussion of the war in general. A notable exception is General James Gavin's recent analysis. It would be truly illuminating to see debate joined on the issues he raises about the potential and cost of our military effort there, particularly whether Vietnam is an acceptable drain on our resources. So far as we can tell, however, that is not the debate Senator FULBRIGHT, the Foreign Relations Committee chairman, and his allies are trying to start.

Instead, their attack on Secretary of State Rusk centered on whether the administration had a congressional mandate to wage the war at all. Now, there is a legitimate theoretical issue in the congressional prerogatives of Congress to declare war and the President to be Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces. But a precedent was established in Korea, where the President waged a conventional war with no formal congressional declaration.

In addition, Congress has passed a resolution unmistakably giving the President the widest discretion in Vietnam. When this resolution was being debated, Senator FULBRIGHT himself stated it was advance authority for whatever the President deemed necessary, not excluding the use of large land armies. And, as Secretary Rusk observed of a related Senate action, there were "no reservations that this doesn't apply if things get tough."

Some committee members also expressed anxiety over the "open endedness" of the Vietnamese situation. That is, China can also escalate, and no one knows where this might lead. Senator CLARK told Mr. Rusk, "Personally, I'm scared to death that we are on the way to world war III."

While nearly everyone dreads the prospect of a larger war, history gives scant support to the notion that endlessly yielding a bit to ambitious powers will prevent larger wars by stilling their ambitions. General Gavin, for one, has no illusion that pulling into coastal enclaves in Vietnam will remove the necessity to resist Communist expansion elsewhere in Asia: "The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand."

Perhaps the general is right that we should consider holding only enclaves in Vietnam; perhaps, on the other hand, retreat there would psychologically undermine resistance elsewhere. Here is an issue which does need clarification; Vietnam may be the worst possible battlefield. Yet it seems clear that somewhere we must accomplish the purpose we seek in Vietnam—checking Asian communism to curb its appetite for expansion.

There may be plenty of reason for wider debate on Vietnam if it is the right debate. But so far at least, Senator FULBRIGHT and like-minded men are asking questions that do little to illuminate the real issues.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

(Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again this House was requested to appropriate a sum of money to permit the House Committee on Un-American Activities to continue its functions throughout the year.

This time the committee has requested a sum of \$425,000 for the performance of its functions, an increase of \$55,000 over the amount which this House authorized during the first session of this Congress.

Then, on April 14, 1965, the committee

again came to the Congress with a request for \$50,000 to investigate the Ku Klux Klan. On both of these requests, I voted against authorizing the expenditures and authorization of these funds.

It has been my contention that this committee has, since its inception abused its powers and failed to justify its continued existence as a permanent investigating committee in aiding Congress to legislate wisely.

The many committees of this House have been held in high regard by the citizens of the United States. It is only the House Committee on Un-American Activities that has created a doubt in the minds of our Nation as to its worthiness as a function part of the legislative process of our Government.

According to the report filed by the committee, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 20, 1966, page 838, the committee expenditures for the period of January 3 to December 31, 1965, amounted to \$350,758.49.

Mr. Speaker, I have advocated that this committee become a part of the Judiciary Committee, which has conducted its business with dignity and decorum. I still maintain that this committee become a part of the Judiciary Committee.

The most recent abuse of its activities occurred last May in Chicago. The committee, according to its chairman, was seeking factual information upon the activities of the Communist Party. What information was received still remains a mystery, but to me it appears that this was a propaganda excursion, one which could again take on the aspect of destroying the reputation and lives of American citizens by publicly accusing them of associations with elements which the committee considers undesirable.

This year's request for funds is the largest that the committee has requested and the largest of any committee of the House. I protest this authorization and if illness had not confined me to my apartment throughout all of last week, I would have been here and voted against this appropriation. For the money we have spent on the activities of this committee we have not been given our money's worth. Its record of legislative accomplishment is so small that its positive actions could be enumerated on about one-half page of a regular letterhead. The principal activities, it appears to me, is not aimed toward legislation but rather in the investigating and exposing individuals and organizations as anti-American or un-American. An appearance before this committee brands one as being against the United States.

I shall, as long as I remain in Congress, refrain from authorizing any funds to any committee which I feel is not performing its proper functions as a committee to permit us to legislate properly for the best interests of all of our citizens and of the country.

DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME

(Mr. GILLIGAN (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

2004

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 3, 1966

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to untangle the time mess that annually hits the Nation during the summer months.

It is entitled the "Uniform Time Act of 1966." States or political subdivisions of States and the District of Columbia, that adopt daylight savings time must do so during a specified period under provisions of the bill. The period begins on the last Sunday in April and ends the last Sunday in October.

The purpose of the bill is to straighten with one uniform law the tangle of different State laws on daylight savings time.

Because of the tangle, businessmen are frustrated in daily transactions, travelers are confused, and millions of dollars are lost needlessly.

My colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable RICHARD H. FULTON, in testifying before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, recently asserted that the time mess costs the Nation's motorbus operators \$250,000 to reprint schedules; the railroads an estimated \$1 million for reprinting schedules; and broadcasters \$1.6 million to tape shows.

The amount lost to businessmen just trying to negotiate intrastate with one another amidst this time crazy quilt surely runs into the millions.

My bill also has an enforcement provision. It provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission may apply to the district court of the United States where such violation occurs and seek court injunction or other process to enforce obedience to the act.

The present hodgepodge of State laws have given the United States the unhappy title of "world's worst time keeper." The country would lose the title under the Uniform Time Act of 1966. I recommend the bill for your consideration and approval.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY

(Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today, along with Congressman Mackay and several others of my colleagues, I introduced a bill to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency. This is a step that we have needed to take for some time and to delay any longer would be folly.

Last year 49,000 persons were killed in the United States in traffic accidents. That is an average of 130 every day. Any other such scourge would be attacked with all the force of our local, State, and National Governments. It is time for us to move with dispatch to reduce the personal and social tragedy in this area.

The State of Iowa has always had a very effective highway safety program directed through the office of the Commissioner of Public Safety. Having had

personal contact with the Commissioner's office, I know there have been many times when he would have welcomed outside direction and assistance as is provided in this measure.

Many of my colleagues have had the same experience I have had when traveling from one State to another and have been confused and needlessly endangered when traffic signal patterns have abruptly changed. With the advent of a National Traffic Safety Agency we could achieve a uniformity in control measures that would make our highways safer, more easily traveled.

It is my sincere hope that my colleagues will join in this move for traffic safety.

EISENHOWER SPEAKS

(Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is of tremendous significance that former President Dwight Eisenhower concurred completely in President Johnson's decision to resume bombing in North Vietnam.

The general's statement is a clear indication of the unity which the country is giving the President in his determination to give our fighting men in Vietnam every support they need.

On this issue there must be no north or south, no east or west. On this issue the country can agree and does agree.

We expect much from our soldiers. We are proud of them. We call them the finest men in all the world—brave and courageous in every sense of the word. The cream of the crop is over there in the rice paddies and jungles of Vietnam. And while we expect much from them, they expect a lot from us.

In giving his full support to the President's decision, General Eisenhower said to have done otherwise would have "given sanctuary to those responsible for sending guerrilla forces and supplies into South Vietnam" for the purpose of imposing their will on the Government and people of that country.

The former President declared that "in the circumstances there was nothing the President could do but order the resumption of the bombing."

Americans in all parts of this land agree with President Johnson and President Eisenhower on this score.

I am sure that any of my colleagues who did not see the statement made by General Eisenhower will find it of vital concern, and for this reason I offer the story from the New York Times for insertion in the RECORD:

EISENHOWER CALLS JOHNSON UNQUESTIONABLY RIGHT—INDEFINITE LULL IN RAIDS WOULD ONLY AID ENEMY, HE SAYS—HANOI DECLINED BY GENERAL FOR ESCALATING CONFLICT

(By Felix Belair)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower said today that President Johnson "unquestionably has made the correct decision" in ordering a resumption of bombing in North Vietnam.

To have done otherwise, General Eisen-

hower said, would have "given sanctuary to those responsible for sending guerrilla forces and supplies into South Vietnam" for the purpose of imposing their will on the Government and people of that country.

The general expressed his views on the President's decision in a telephone conversation from his winter residence in Desert City, Calif. His response to a request for comment was immediate and extemporeous.

In addition to providing safe passage from the north for the guerrilla forces and supplies infiltrating into South Vietnam through Laos, he asserted, an indefinite suspension of bombing would "only make certain that he would have to face the Communist aggressor on other battlefields elsewhere in southeast Asia."

BRINKMANSHP DENIED

"We are in South Vietnam at the invitation of that Government," he said, "and I'm for winning the battle here and not in some more remote place not of our own choosing."

He had no sympathy at all, General Eisenhower said, with some Members of the Senate and others who maintained that a bombing resumption in the north would be escalating the war and playing at brinkmanship with a nuclear world war III.

He contended that it was Hanoi, working through the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, the political affiliate of the Vietcong, that had done the escalating. In addition to a completely negative response to President Johnson's peace overtures, he said, North Vietnam's Communist regime had used the period of suspended bombing to strengthen their forces in the south and send more equipment.

The Vietcong forces had expanded their attacks on U.S. military installations and barracks while continuing their bombing of nonmilitary civilian targets such as buses and other public facilities, the former President said.

All this required that American forces react, and the bombing of North Vietnamese targets was part of that reaction, he said. He added that "in the circumstances there was nothing the President could do but order a resumption of the bombing."

General Eisenhower's voice was strong and he was at no loss for words to express his views on the President's decision. He said he was feeling fine again and today had played 9 holes of golf.

Although General Eisenhower did not say so, his views on any U.S. military involvement always are considered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and are sometimes solicited by President Johnson.

Without going into the question of limited warfare as opposed to an expansion of hostilities in Vietnam, General Eisenhower rejected the recent proposal by Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin (retired) that the U.S. forces withdraw into several coastal enclaves in South Vietnam so as to limit the war while pursuing peace efforts.

The general raised the question of what the Vietcong would be doing throughout the rest of South Vietnam while U.S. forces sat securely in their enclaves.

Answering his own question, he said that as in the case of an indefinite suspension of bombings, such a course would only postpone an inevitable decision to meet force with force.

McNAMARA ADDS NEW ERROR TO RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the faulty judgment of the Secretary of De-

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1995

On this list are some of the largest and most successful companies in the United States. A new advantage to advertising has been recently revealed, and since it affects a corporation which is considering becoming part of Lorain, the facts are worth noting.

United Artists was an advertiser who placed a full page ad in the 1964 Democratic National Convention program. The cost of this ad was \$15,000. The same corporation also took a full page ad in the Democrats' advertising book "Toward an Age of Greatness" published in December 1965. Again the cost was \$15,000. Both of these ads appeared in spite of the fact that Federal law makes it a crime for either corporations or labor unions to make contributions or expenditures "in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office." (Title 18, sec. 610.)

Could this advertising have resulted in the fact that on January 6, 1966, a hearing examiner from the Federal Communications Commission recommended that United Artists Broadcasting, Inc., be awarded a construction permit for a new television broadcast station supposedly assigned to Lorain, Ohio? The FCC conveniently ignored the fact that the broadcast tower is to be located in Cleveland. Also glossed over were certain antitrust questions concerning United Artists.

It is nice to know that large corporations can benefit from the Great Society as well as impoverished individuals, especially if the large corporations know the value of advertising in the political publications of the Democratic Party.

A FLICKER OF HOPE FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last 24 hours would indicate that there is a flicker of hope today that the President will succeed in chartering a course which could bring the conflict in Vietnam to the negotiating table. I say advisedly and stress that it is only a flicker, only a thin sliver of hope but I am sure that to the millions of parents in this country, fathers and mothers whose youngsters are of draft age; to the tens of thousands of parents in this country whose boys are now in the service and who are actually serving in Vietnam, and to the millions of young men who are most directly involved in these events, even such a flicker can be a source of cautious comfort.

The inspiring victory scored yesterday by our Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, in bringing before the United Nations Security Council a full-scale discussion of the Vietnam conflict is the basis for this flicker of hope.

Following closely behind Ambassador Goldberg's success of yesterday, is the statement made today by the South Vietnam Ambassador, Vu Van Thai, who, according to the Associated Press, said that his government believes the Vietnam war could be halted on the basis of the 1954 Geneva Agreement. The

Associated Press dispatch states that he made a comment after a 1 hour and 10 minute meeting with U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Thai said he had made a "complete tour of all the problems facing us at this stage. There is an identity of views both in standing against aggression and in the sincere desire of both of our governments to continue the search for peace."

The Ambassador said the Saigon Government had been consulted and was in full agreement with the United States before President Johnson's move in taking the peace bid to the United Nations Security Council.

Asked about the reconvening of the 1954 Geneva Conference, which would include Communist China, North Vietnam, and the Soviet Union, as well as Britain, France, and the United States, Thai said:

Our Government has made clear that while we were not a signatory to the Geneva agreement, we feel that the war could be stopped on the basis of the Geneva agreement.

The main violation of that agreement has been due to the aggression from the north.

Our Government has reiterated the principle of the right of the Vietnamese to choose their own institutions through free and democratic elections.

But he said that this could not be carried out until the aggression has been stopped.

I think the fact that nine nations voted with us yesterday at the United Nations to bring this whole Vietnam conflict before the Security Council is a great source of hope.

We can all recall that by using this United Nations international forum in 1962, and exposing for the whole world to see the full details of the Communist conspiracy in Cuba, President Kennedy was able to marshal world support and indignation against the Soviet Union for placing missiles in Cuba. It was this world indignation that helped avoid a major confrontation when the Soviets withdrew. While I am mindful of those who criticized the shortcomings of the United Nations—and, on occasion, I, too, have been impatient with it—it appears to me that the record is clear that the United Nations can become an instrument for resolving disputes which could lead to major world conflict.

The United Nations did play a vital role in 1962. But let us not forget also that as a corollary to using the United Nations as a forum to bring before the world all of the facts on Cuba, we had a President then, as we have a President now, not afraid to stand up to aggression during the discussions.

I firmly believe the wisdom of President Johnson's decision to renew bombing of North Vietnam is beginning to demonstrate to the world the sincerity of our purpose as Americans in defending South Vietnam during the agonizing period while we search for other methods to end the war.

We want peace above everything. That is a matter of indisputable record.

We have exerted and exhausted every single one of our resources in the search for that peace. But, at the same time,

we are not going to let our allies down. We are not going to see South Vietnam abandoned because we know that to abandon South Vietnam today would merely whet the appetites of those who would conquer freedom throughout the world.

I warned 2 weeks ago of the Tri-Continental Communist Congress held in Cuba during the first 2 weeks of January. For those people who cannot understand why Mr. Johnson has to follow this parallel track—on the one hand, using whatever resources are at our disposal to bomb military installations in Vietnam; and then, on the other hand, looking for peace in the United Nations—let them just read the record of that Tri-Continental Congress and let them understand that the Communists have devised a new technique of warfare.

Our Nation, by building up the huge war machine that we have, has made major war too expensive. I think it is safe to presume that there will be no major exchange of nuclear devices between the major powers because all parties concerned realize what a costly approach that would be.

And so the Communists have now devised a new technique of conquest by subversion, conquest by terrorism, and the testing ground for this new technique is South Vietnam.

The Tri-Continental Congress clearly went on record to repeat this subversion and terrorism to seize nation after nation on the continents of Africa, Asia and Latin America. It is important for those who urge we abandon Vietnam to know that much more than just a piece of real estate in Vietnam is involved in this war.

For this country today to walk away from South Vietnam without resolving that problem and without guaranteeing for those people the right to self-determination would be to give the green light to Communist leaders on three continents, who brazenly and boldly spelled out their plans in Havana for 15 days in the first 2 weeks of January. They told us openly how they plan to carry on the same kind of subversion and terrorism throughout the whole of Asia, throughout the whole of Africa, and throughout the whole of South America. This is the new technique of the International Comintern, which is being reestablished throughout the world.

And so, for all of those well-meaning Americans who would say that we ought to leave Vietnam, that they do not like Vietnam, I submit and suggest that they look at the record of Havana during the first 2 weeks of January.

I submit that the President is following the course that is the only course for Americans to follow.

I submit that there is a reason why Hanoi and Peiping, and, yes, even Moscow, do not want to see this conflict resolved. It is becoming crystal clear that Hanoi and Peiping and Moscow would just as soon have this conflict continued in South Vietnam, because they feel that they have all of our attention centered there, all of our energies directed there, while in the meantime, they are free to roam all over the world and engage in their subversion.

1996

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 3, 1966

To those who cannot understand the global aspect of the Vietnam conflict, let me remind them that in this last year, 12 governments of the African Continent have gone down and have been wiped out through subversion and conflict, very much along the same lines that we now see in Vietnam.

I say that President Johnson's policy in Vietnam—carrying the olive branch of peace in one hand and the arrows of defense in the other, is the only policy. It is a policy aimed at preventing world war III.

I am proud that the overwhelming majority of American people who are deeply concerned about Vietnam, who want an honorable victory in Vietnam, have shown a maturity never before demonstrated in America in saying to the President: "Mr. President, we are with you. We trust your judgment. We trust freedom's future in your hands. We trust our survival to your guidance."

God grant that we could have had this kind of understanding in 1935 and 1936 and 1937, when another great President stood in Chicago at the Outer Drive Bridge and called for a quarantine of the first aggressors of that era. He warned in those days that if we did not stop aggression at that point, it would spread into a major conflict. And he was a prophet to be dealt with, because indeed the world sat back, and we saw the devastation that followed in World War II.

I say to those who urge a policy of withdrawal before the battle is ended that they fail to look at history.

Right here on Pennsylvania Avenue, down the street from the Capitol, in front of the National Archives Building, there are two inscriptions: One says "What Is Past Is Prolog," and the other says "Study the Past." Now, if anybody still wonders what we are doing in Vietnam, let them just study the past and they will see what we are doing in Vietnam. We are defending freedom and stopping aggression before it gets out of hand.

We have said we will not be fooled again. So we are trying to move forward on two courses, one at the peace table, while the other contains aggression.

I am confident that the breakthrough Ambassador Goldberg scored in the United Nations yesterday in winning support for the President's request that the Vietnam question be brought to the United Nations Security Council, is the first major breakthrough. Oh, I am mindful of the veto and I am mindful of all the other things the Communists can do to block us at the U.N. I know that there will be a long, hard road to follow at the United Nations before we can even hope to bring this thing to an honorable conclusion and solution, but at least we are moving forward.

As we look back in history again and as we look at the role that the United Nations has played in Cuba and in the Congo and in the Gaza strip and as we go down the line and see the record of the United Nations, we Americans today can look at this little flicker of hope and see that maybe by the grace of God, we

can get out of Vietnam with honor and still preserve the dignity and freedom of those people we have vowed to protect.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I have thrilled at the words of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. I agree with him 100 percent. It was my privilege to be in South Vietnam for a period of a week about 2 months ago. I was there the day of the bombing of the Metropol Hotel in Saigon. I was the first American civilian to reach the site of that bombing. I remember the sickening feeling which

came over me as I contemplated the havoc, the carnage, the desolation caused by that explosion in which some 133 persons were seriously injured and 8 were killed. I realized then that the tactics of the Vietcong were absolutely devoid of morality. I realized that they were desperate and fanatical in the pursuit of their objectives. I came away from that country more determined than ever to stand firm to resist this kind of terrorism. I was told, for example, that during 1965 the Vietcong averaged about 850 acts of terrorism every single week for an entire year's period. The amount of terrorism has actually gone up rather than down in the last 2 or 3 months. I felt then and I feel now—and I believe most of the American people feel strongly—that this type of conduct cannot be tolerated. It violates all of the rules of decency and of acceptable conduct, yes, even for warfare.

I heartily approve of the course of our Nation in standing firm. I commend the distinguished gentleman for what he said.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for his contribution. I would certainly like to associate myself with his remarks. This is the thing we have been trying to explain to the American people. We are fighting a war in Vietnam unlike anything that civilization has ever fought before. In the classical sense of warfare, there were armies with uniforms and tanks and there was some code of ethics toward soldiers including a code of exchanging prisoners of war which has been set up over the years. Going back through the whole history of civilization, man's inhumanity toward his fellow man had some sort of standards at least for the military personnel. However, what we are fighting in Vietnam today is a completely new concept of Communist warfare which can strike in any country or in any section of the world. You are fighting men that you cannot identify as the enemy, men who work the fields during the day and in the evening, with the very same clothes on, but heavily armed by Hanoi and Peiping, go out and commit acts of violence, terrorism, and subversion. These are terrorists who have not stopped at murdering, executing 60,000 of South Vietnamese city, village, and municipal officials. They have destroyed entire local governments. They are taking mayors and city councilmen and

police chiefs and all others responsible for orderly government and putting them up against the wall and destroying them. That is the kind of war we are fighting in Vietnam. For us to walk away from it now would be an open invitation for this kind of terrorism all over the world, and I say, also, here in the United States. Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, is the testing ground for an entirely new method of terrorism and subversion with which the Communists hope to conquer the world through so-called "small wars of liberation."

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and compliment him on his constructive and discerning analysis of this situation. I subscribe to what you have said and associate myself with your analysis of the situation. I want to be counted among those who are standing squarely behind the President in handling this most difficult situation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his statement. I yield back the balance of my time.

SUPPORTING PRESIDENT JOHN SON'S POLICY IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Rosenthal). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the President's foreign policy in Vietnam since its inception and I support it today.

I believe the principles contained in the United Nations Charter comprise the basic foundation for mediation and conciliation between nations. Two of the most important principles are:

First, condemnation of military aggression by one nation against another as a means of settling a dispute; and

Second, the right of self-determination by the people of any nation in free and uncoerced elections.

In Vietnam we have naked aggression by the North Vietnamese hard core military troops and covert infiltrators against the people in the Republic of South Vietnam.

Since 1954-55 we have had a planned North Vietnamese four-pronged program of infiltration, subversion, terrorism, and guerrilla military takeover of villages and areas in South Vietnam.

Another principle of the United Nations involves regional agreements between nations to come to each other's aid at the request of the aggrieved nation. These agreements to aid in the event of aggression may be either bilateral, as between two nations, or multilateral, through regional organizations such as NATO or SEATO.

In the instant case of Vietnam, it is true we were not signatory to the Geneva agreement of 1954, but we did take official note of the agreement and issued

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1997

a statement saying we would view any renewal of aggression with grave concern and we, as a nation, would refrain from the use of force to disturb the status of those nations whose boundaries were set in the Geneva agreement of 1954.

Since 1950 we had helped Indochina—which included Vietnam—with economic and military assistance. We have continued that help to Vietnam under bilateral arrangements, at their request, up to the present time. As the aggression increased from North Vietnam, aided and abetted by Red China, we were faced with renouncing our commitments or continuing our economic and military aid on a larger scale.

Three administrations—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—had deemed it a commitment of honor to continue our economic and military aid to Vietnam.

It has been considered important to our Nation as well as the free world that the new formula of Communist conquest be checked. Failure to check this planned formula of Communist conquest in Vietnam would be considered a betrayal of commitment by the Vietnamese Government and a reflection on the integrity of U.S. commitments to our other allies. It would also constitute an encouragement to further use of the four pronged formula of Communist conquest in troubled spots throughout the world.

I am deeply troubled and concerned because large scale military action in Vietnam is necessary. I have urged the President to leave no stone unturned in the quest for peace without sacrifice of national honor.

I believe the President has made every effort to achieve negotiations for peace.

What else can he do while maintaining our national honor?

Of course, as Commander in Chief he can order our military forces to retreat from Vietnam.

Is this what his critics want him to do?

Is this what the American people want him to do?

Let us be done with general criticism and ask those who criticize to suggest specific alternatives.

I am confident the great majority of the American people are supporting the President in his handling of the Vietnam problem. They believe he has indeed walked "the long mile" in the pursuit of peace. Certainly there has never been, within my personal knowledge, as many offers to go from the battlefield to the conference table. These offers have been made by the President and by the Secretary of State many, many times. The voluntary cessation of air strikes for 37 days, accompanied by a worldwide series of personal appeals carried by a blue ribbon panel of personal emissaries including Vice President HUMPHREY, was of no avail.

The cessation of air strikes was used by the Vietcong to strengthen their military resources for further aggression. The President's personal emissaries returned without any concession on the part of the aggressors.

I was in favor of the cessation of bombing in order that we could explore

to the utmost the possibility of peace. No one can say a cessation of air strikes for 37 days, in the face of continuous attacks, was too short for conciliatory action by the Vietcong. No one can say, in retrospect, the Vietcong buildup in unopposed transportation of war supplies and unharassed infiltration of manpower will not be reflected in the loss of additional American and South Vietnamese lives.

This was the chance we took in the quest for peace. This is the further burden we bear as a result of the Vietcong's refusal to negotiate for peace at the conference table.

There are those who will continue to cry for peace at the price of honor, at the price of appeasement of tyranny and in the face of military aggression on the territory of a legally established nation. There will continue to be those who allow their desire for peace to becloud their evaluation of the realities of the Communist planned formula for conquest of desperate people ruled by weak and unstable governments.

I have no desire to silence dissent. I have no desire to sit in judgment on my colleagues whose conclusions differ from mine. They, of course, must answer to their consciences as I shall answer to mine.

I yield to no man a greater desire for peace. For 20 years I have studied the perils of the atomic age. I know the power of every type of atomic and atomic-hydrogen weapon. I have conducted extensive hearings on the effects an atomic war would have on man and his environment. For 7 consecutive years, my Subcommittee on Military Operations studied the problem of civil defense in the atomic age. Our reports on civil defense, atomic radiation, and the effects of atomic weapons are the most comprehensive and reliable group of reports on these closely related subjects.

I am aware of the massive total explosive power contained in our inventory of nuclear weapons and have been informed of our intelligence estimates of the nuclear power of other nations. I cite this background of information and knowledge not in a spirit of braggadocio or arrogance. Such knowledge leaves little room for egotism. It does impose on this Member a soberness and a desire for peace based on the conviction that man cannot blunder into a nuclear war if civilization is to survive. Therefore, the nations of the world must find the way to peace. That way, however, will not be found by surrender to the aggressor, nor will it be found through the betrayal of honorable commitments to nations which are based on the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter.

Neither will it come, at this time, through reliance on the defective peace enforcement provisions of the United Nations in cases of national controversy. The principles of the United Nations Charter are noble but upon that foundation of principles we, the member nations, have not as yet perfected the functions of adjudication and enforcement.

Until these functions, envisaged by its

founders, are developed we must live in a world torn between the high ideals of the United Nations Charter and the stern and ugly realities of national controversy. We must find accommodations for balancing military power, restraining total commitment to war, protecting weak nations against aggression, and eliminating the causes of war.

I was pleased at the President's decision to take the Vietnam problem before the United Nations. Any crisis as threatening to world peace as the one in Vietnam should be discussed in the highest international forum which is available. We realize the limitations of the United Nations mechanism. Encumbered as it is with obstructive possibilities and deficient powers, it still has great present and potential value.

The United Nations will never reach the goal of fulfillment planned by its originators unless it is given difficult tasks to perform. The test of performance will disclose its weaknesses and defects. While I approve of President Johnson's decision to refer the Vietnam problem to the United Nations for debate and full discussion, I realize such referral does not guarantee an ideal solution nor does it, in itself, relieve the United States from our commitment of honor to the Republic of Vietnam. It does not remove the need for bilateral or regional defense group agreements to protect the weak from predatory aggression until there is a United Nations peace enforcement arm.

While the United Nations debates the Vietnam problem, and I welcome such debate, we must answer the Vietcong aggression with the only method they apparently respect. That is overwhelming military power. They have refused the olive branch and we are forced to continue the use of the sword. This is not the first time, nor will it be the last time, the people of the United States have been asked to sacrifice in the cause of freedom, in the cause of opposing aggression.

I support the President in the resumption of air strikes against the forces of aggression. I know he will keep the door open for peace negotiations. I know that door will swing wide when the aggressor realizes aggression cannot win. I know the road to peace has to be the road of honor and surrender to aggression will but whet the appetite of the aggressor for larger and more dangerous adventures.

This Nation seeks no conquest of territory or people. We seek to live in peace with all men and we are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to stop aggression before it embroils the world in a greater and more dangerous struggle.

U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL RAISES
HIGH THE HOPES OF THE WORLD
TOWARD ESTABLISHING DURA-
BLE AND HONORABLE PEACE IN
VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

1998

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 3, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the U.N. Security Council raised high the hopes of the world yesterday by voting to debate the U.S. resolution calling for immediate discussions, without preconditions, to establish a durable and honorable peace in Vietnam. Having accepted its rightful responsibility, and having elected to assume its role in man's endless quest for peace, it is now incumbent upon the Security Council to make a determined effort to meet its responsibility and discharge its role, by marshaling every human and institutional resource at its command, to bring peace to this troubled world of ours.

I command the President and Ambassador Goldberg for addressing this problem to the United Nations. In our era, the problem of war is the world's problem. The task of concluding hostilities and confining the possibilities of escalation, defy accomplishment by any one nation—no matter how honest its purpose, no matter how true its strivings. Because the world recognized its collective responsibility for peace, it fashioned an organization to which it could turn when collective action was required to preserve its noblest ideals. Our presentation of this issue to the United Nations reflects our confidence in that institution. The extent to which this confidence is well placed, will substantially affect the course of history, and the future ability of the United Nations to guide that course along the paths of peace.

Since last July, I have been ardently and continually advocating an effective U.N. involvement in the southeast Asian crisis. I am heartened that this call has been answered, and I am confident that appropriate machinery can be developed for containing and concluding the hostilities in Vietnam. I am certain that constructive proposals can be advanced and adopted by the member states of the United Nations. Whether such action will be taken will depend, in large measure, on their willingness to put aside petty differences in the interest of world peace. No greater task could be assigned to the United Nations, no greater opportunity could be afforded it.

WESTERN ARMS TO THE ARAB STATES: FISHING IN TROUBLED WATERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, along with many colleagues, I was shocked and dismayed by the recent official acknowledgment that the United States is actively engaged in arranging fresh arms shipments to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Tanks were supplied to Jordan and a \$400 million Anglo-American deal has been negotiated with Saudi Arabia; I understand further that Jordan will purchase an additional \$80 million worth of aircraft from Great Britain.

To my knowledge these policy decisions were reached and pursued while the Congress was in recess; I don't think,

realistically, that the Congress, in view of its past expressions and sentiments, is sympathetic to this new direction.

For it raises serious questions regarding American intentions in the Middle East; it undermines our purpose of stemming the wasteful commitment to armaments, a continuing source of tension, temptation, and unreasoned belligerence.

The Soviet Union and other Communist states have poured arms into the area; this remains the most direct threat to peace. The Arab arms buildup, which the United States is now supporting, represents an immediate threat to the prospects for peace in the Middle East.

I have been in communication with the Department of State on this matter. Early in January, before the Congress reconvened, I asked the Department to supply me with an official accounting of the military capability of the Arab States, as compared to the status of Israel's defenses. The Department, in explaining the fresh arms shipments, contends that a military balance will be retained, and that Israel's security is not threatened. I am awaiting a reply from the Department on this question.

I must say at this point, however, that all estimates thus far lead me to the inescapable conclusion that the planned arms commitments to Jordan and Saudi Arabia will undoubtedly put Israel in an extremely precarious position; Communist-bloc supplies have established a formidable aggressive arsenal.

Nor can one ignore the psychological impact of spiraling arms purchases. They radiate a momentum which seldom stays within the bounds of reason. Security must be maximized.

The United States has at length professed its opposition to proliferation of armaments. In the Middle East, where you have a situation of continuing change and where one nation is encircled by forces hostile to her, this policy of limiting military capacity is especially valid. There are constantly new vacuums and incessant juggling for power. I can think of no greater source of danger than to inflate temper and ambition by dispatch of new and modern weapons. By facilitating further arms shipments to the Middle East, the United States is promoting further proliferation of military might which, in long-range terms, can only increase tension, divert resources and talent, and involve the great powers to a more dangerous extent.

This new direction in our policy is, I fear, fraught with the greatest peril. We should rather steer our efforts toward the possibilities of securing, step by step, the annulment of suspicion, the recognition of basic realities, and the attainment of an amicable settlement of outstanding differences.

I can only surmise that the American arms initiative is motivated by naive expediency, by the false expectation of temporary favor, all of which has proved elusive in the past. A great nation such as ours has a responsibility to uphold the standards of peaceful behavior as long as developments do not endanger the national security.

It seems to me that in this situation we can do little else except insure that relative balance in the Middle East is indeed secured. Our Government must now take all necessary steps to insure that Israel's deterrent force retains credibility.

A JOB WELL DONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, despite some recent attempts to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the overwhelming majority of the American people have an implicit faith in this most amazing of Federal agencies. The FBI annual report for 1965 proves beyond a doubt that this faith is justified:

The FBI during the past year relayed approximately 180,000 items of criminal information from informants and other sources to appropriate authorities, resulting in over 7,500 arrests by Federal and local authorities.

The FBI actually made money for the U.S. Government during 1965: 12,640 convictions in FBI cases resulted in well over \$250 million in fines, savings, and recoveries which far exceeded the funds spent to operate the Bureau last year.

In the area of civil rights, FBI investigations were responsible for the apprehension of a number of those involved in major violations of Federal civil rights statutes.

During the year just ended the FBI continued to probe the activities of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and Mr. Hoover again warned the American public that the machinations of the Communist Party, U.S.A., are to be underestimated and disparaged at our peril. Once again all America was served notice that the allegiance of our Nation's youth is prized by the Communist Party, and the use of Communist speakers on campuses, Communist participation in demonstrations, and the expansion of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs—a Communist Party front—are some of the vehicles designed by the Communist Party, U.S.A. to trap unsuspecting American students.

The accomplishments of the FBI during the preceding year are too many and varied to list. However, the public statement released by the Bureau on January 6, 1966, provides a brief but comprehensive summation of the FBI's activities during 1965.

As in the case of every entity worthy of respect and emulation, to know is to appreciate. Accordingly, I include this account of the Bureau's 1965 achievements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, with appropriate subheadings added:

REPORT BY THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, in a statement to Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach today, advised that record highs were reached in almost all major phases of FBI operations during the 1965 calendar year.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. Hoover advised that alltime highs were recorded by the location of nearly 14,000

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1989

is completely contrary to the proposal of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee that our merchant marine fleet be expanded.

This budget reduction of funds for construction subsidies to 13 ships for fiscal 1967 comes at a time when our replacement program is already more than 90 vessels behind schedule, and this reduction will only compound an already existing deficiency in our replacement program.

A strong merchant fleet is indispensable to the commerce and security of our country and the free world. Only merchant ships can carry the needed cargo and can handle the movement of supplies and men in time of emergency. Our foreign and domestic economy, and the importance of balance of payments, make expansion of the shipping industry under the American flag absolutely necessary.

I am at a loss to understand the budget proposals for 1967 just as I could not understand, and strongly opposed, the cutbacks in recent years at our Nation's shipyards. Shipbuilding and ship repairing in this country have reached an all-time low. The United States has dropped to 12th place among the top shipbuilding nations of the world. Even Poland and Yugoslavia rank above us, and Japan's shipbuilding triples that of the United States.

In my State of New York we are well aware of the consequences of our shipbuilding decline, both public and private. Both Bethlehem and Todd have curtailed their shipbuilding activities in the New York area, and the closing of the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard, which I vigorously opposed, has caused unemployment and hardship for thousands. New York is the largest port and trade center in the world, and yet the 1967 budget allows only \$1 million for harbor improvement projects—an extremely low figure in comparison to the needs and the importance of the port of New York.

Mr. Speaker, shipbuilding in our own shipyards should expand and increase, providing employment and preserving the needs of our American merchant fleet. I am opposed, as is the chairman of my Merchant Marine Committee, to any plan for the foreign construction of ships for subsidized operations under the U.S. flag. Building abroad would further debilitate our shipyards and thus weaken our ability to meet unusual demands on our fleet. We must expand our merchant fleet through construction in U.S. shipyards, and we should preserve and maintain our repository of trained manpower in our shipyard facilities. It does not make sense to propose a "building abroad" program and cut back at our own shipyards.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 intended that the United States have an American-flag fleet capable of carrying a substantial portion of our waterborne commerce and of serving as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. Despite this, our American-flag merchant marine has continued to decline in number of ships, percentage of our cargoes carried in these vessels, and in job opportunities

for our merchant seamen and our ship-builders. We have slipped to the point where we have a mere handful of only 900 ocean-going vessels. The budget figure for 1967 for 13 merchant ships is but a drop in the bucket compared to Soviet Russia's over 400 merchant vessels under construction or on order.

Between 1954 and 1960 the U.S. merchant marine fleet decreased 310,000 tons a year while the Soviet Union fleet increased 450,000 tons annually. And in 1961-1962 and 1963 we dropped 400,000 tons annually. The Soviet Union is moving toward control of the oceans and trade routes, and in the current Vietnam situation, we have to turn to foreign-flag ships for commercial commitments and to carry military cargoes as well. The percentage of our foreign commerce which is moving on American-flag ships is now less than 10 percent. We must check this steady decline. Our success in Vietnam depends on our ability to transport men and materials. We should not have to depend on others to carry our foreign commerce.

A significant increase in construction subsidies for our merchant fleet, which I strongly urge, would produce a more efficient and modern fleet. This, in time and in turn, would reduce the amount of operating subsidy needed. We must recognize the fact that our higher American standard of living makes it highly unlikely that we would ever be able to eliminate these subsidies.

I am also concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the failure on numerous occasions of our Government to carry out the policy of cargo preference of Public Law 664, enacted by the Congress in 1954, which provided that at least 50 percent of U.S. Government-generated cargo should be carried in American-flag vessels, if such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates. Congressional supervision and action have made some improvements in this situation, but there are still many instances where the cargo preference requirement is not being met.

Mr. Speaker, we must have a strong U.S.-flag merchant marine, American built and manned, adequate to meet peacetime as well as wartime needs. Because I am deeply concerned about the present plight of our merchant fleet, I call this matter to the attention of the Congress.

I am pleased that my Merchant Marine Committee, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman EDWARD A. GARMATZ, will soon hold hearings on the present condition and future plans for the American merchant marine. I have urged the following action: First, a study of the actual readiness and capabilities of our merchant marine; second, that the 1967 budget figures be sufficient to meet the needs of an adequate merchant marine fleet; third, that our Government take action to increase U.S. carriage of waterborne foreign commerce as recommended by the President's Maritime Advisory Committee and that action be taken to support and expand shipbuilding in U.S. shipyards adequate to accomplish this; and fourth, that our Govern-

ment more effectively administer the 50-50 cargo preference law.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S DENTAL HEALTH WEEK

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my pleasure to direct my colleagues' attention to National Children's Dental Health Week. This event will be celebrated during the week of February 6 and, as is traditional, special programs of varying types will be held in communities across the Nation. National Children's Dental Health Week is the one time of the year when the Nation's dentists make a concerted effort to call attention to the importance of oral health and to the simple procedures that can be followed in the home that, when coupled with visits to the family dentist and school dental health education programs, help insure a healthier citizenry.

National Children's Dental Health Week takes on this year a special significance because of another event that will be taking place this month. On February 27, the American Dental Association will be dedicating its new headquarters building in Chicago. The new 23-story building will house not only the association but also a number of special groups within the fields of dental research, education, and care. It is intended to be, and I am sure will soon become, the national and international headquarters of dentistry.

The traditional celebration of National Children's Dental Health Week symbolizes the remarkable strides taken by dentistry over the past 20 years and which has brought it to a new level of maturity and accomplishment. The American public of today understands more clearly than ever before that there is an intimate relationship between oral health and general health. It understands that the achievement of higher national standards of oral health depends not merely on the practicing dentist, the dental educator or the dental research scientist, but on the individual citizen and parent as well. Oral disease is not dramatic, but it is insidious. Tooth decay remains the most common disease we know with periodontal or gum disease continuing to be a most serious affliction among our adult population. Oral cancer continues to show a frighteningly high mortality rate, a rate worse than most forms of cancer.

Much then remains to be done. But the continuing improvement in public understanding coupled with the clear indications that the dental profession continues to move forward rapidly makes this a time of greater promise for the Nation's dental health than ever before in history.

IN SUPPORT OF THEIR COUNTRY

(Mr. CALLAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

1990

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 3, 1966

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, recently I have brought to the attention of the House the efforts of courageous Americans in support of their country, and particularly in support of our fight for freedom in Vietnam. I tell these stories, Mr. Speaker, because I fear that in the outburst of public attention to the anti-American demonstrations, these efforts might go unnoticed.

Today I have asked consent to insert in the RECORD the "Statement of the American Student Position on Vietnam and Communism," which came to me from the Young Americans for Freedom at Wesleyan College in Macon, Ga., and which bore the signature of 600 students and professors. They, like all Americans, are proud to make known their support of the brave people of South Vietnam, and of the brave men that we have sent to fight with them.

The statement referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN STUDENT POSITION ON VIETNAM AND COMMUNISM

We young Americans—students and citizens—solemnly and in all sincerity declare:

That, since it is contrary to our American traditions that an unrepresentative and radical leftist minority be permitted, without dispute, to speak through our communications media as if representative of students as a whole, we feel it our duty as a responsible majority to express what we consider the firm convictions of the majority of students on the following vital issues confronting our Nation today:

1. We believe that it is the sovereign right of any people to determine by free and honorable means the form of government under which they wish to live.

2. We believe that the people of Vietnam, having so chosen, and having requested the aid of the United States of America to resist a tyrannical aggressor, should be given all possible aid by the U.S. forces to bring this conflict to a victorious conclusion for the forces of freedom.

3. We believe that our forces overseas in Vietnam and wherever similar Communist aggressions have occurred and may occur should be given our fullest support psychologically, morally, and militarily.

4. We believe that commonsense and practicality dictate that violent Communist aggression is best faced and overcome now on foreign soil and that the American soldier in Vietnam and elsewhere abroad is in reality defending his own nation, state, home, and family.

The torch of freedom is ours. Let us take it up and hold it high.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order previously granted me for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 9, I find that I am not recorded. I was present and voted "yea," and ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

SALES TAX

(Mr. HALLECK (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if anybody in either party had proposed an 11 percent sales tax he would have been hounded out of public life. Yet that is exactly what has happened under this administration's inflationary policies and the Great Society.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in the 5 years from December 1961 through December 1965, the cost of tomatoes is up 50 percent, center-cut pork chops are up 23 percent. Potatoes rose 21 percent, coffee increased 15 percent, and grade A eggs are up 10 percent. All of this is on a national average. In many cities the increases are much higher.

The same sort of thing is true of nearly every item that enters the cost-of-living index prepared by the Department of Labor, HEW, and other agencies.

If you do not believe the spiraling cost figures, just ask your wife. The spiral is moving upward at increasing speed. She can give you a day-by-day count on swift-rising costs.

HIGHER COST OF LIVING

(Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, administration spokesmen keep insisting that prices have been kept stable under the Great Society.

At the same time official statistics show that meat prices went up 13½ percent in 1965 to a record high. In the past 5 years prices for food have risen about 11 percent.

When the Great Society talks about stable prices, I guess we all know what kind of stable they are talking about. Was not one of the famous labors of Hercules to clean out the Augean stable, where all those bulls were kept?

The only thing steady about prices for Americans since Eisenhower is the increasing speed of the spiral of costs of living and the equally steady erosion of the buying power of the dollar.

PRICE STABILITY

(Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the administration keeps insisting that this country enjoys "price stability." Under the Great Society prices are about as steady

as a drunken man on roller skates on an icy sidewalk.

In just 5 years, almost everything that people eat, wear, or use has gone up—up—up—and the dollar has gone down—down—in purchasing power.

On the basis of official Federal figures from September 1961, to the latest available in 1965 men's shoes are up over 11 percent in cost, suit cleaning and pressing 8 percent, a private hospital room 17 percent, a physician's home visit 13 percent, a haircut 10 percent, a permanent wave 10 percent, cigarettes 11 percent, 8-hour domestic service 13 percent, and movie tickets 17 percent.

And prices continue to spiral. If you doubt this, ask your neighborhood grocer who charges you at least 11 percent more overall than he did 5 years ago.

INFLATION

(Mr. ROUDEBUSH (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, in 5 years of freewheeling, high spending razzle-dazzle under the Democrats, the dollar—cut loose from the ballast of gold, silver, and fiscal integrity—is leading us into runaway price inflation.

The 1961 rent dollar is now worth only 95.6 cents, the apparel dollar is down to 96.4 cents, the medical dollar is down to 91 cents, transportation to 94.5 cents, and the housing and rent dollar has dropped over 4 cents in this 5-year period.

Inflation is the crudest and most cowardly form of taxation ever devised, falling with especially crushing force on the poor and the old as well as the people with small fixed incomes.

This is a tax, however, that falls on everyone living in these United States. It is a betrayal of the American people.

VIETNAM

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, according to news reports last week, the Communists in North Vietnam took good advantage of the pause in our bombing there to construct several missile sites. They also rebuilt many bridges, repaired damaged roads, and generally strengthened their position as the source of arms and supplies to the guerrillas fighting our men and the South Vietnamese people.

We can be very sure that the North Vietnamese are not alone in their efforts. They receive substantial and essential help from outside in building missile installations and in acquiring equipment needed to carry on their war, whether they do it during a bombing pause or not.

Soviet Russia, as well as East European Communist satellite nations, are engaged in heavy supply operations to help North Vietnam. East German and Polish correspondents have written freely of massed antiaircraft batteries and trucks

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1991

which could come only from Soviet Russia.

Most of these supplies move from Russia to Vietnam by sea. Radio Moscow itself announced on December 23, "A constant caravan of merchant ships plies the line from Odessa, the Soviet Union's biggest Black Sea port, to Haiphong, the port of Hanoi."

The broadcast went on to say that these ships are delivering goods which North Vietnam sorely needs. Polish ships also carry goods, including modern equipment, to Vietnam.

In order to reach Haiphong all these ships must pass through the Gulf of Tonkin, which is said to be controlled by some of the largest and fastest American naval units, including naval aircraft.

More and more these days there is reason to take action. To me it is incredible that we sit by and do nothing about this while our men are being shot at every day in Vietnam.

The only explanation for our inaction has been that we are not officially at war. But this is not adequate. It infers that if we take action to stop this shipping we will be taking an act of war.

Actually, there are different types of blockades, and some are clearly not classified as acts of war. In 1962 President Kennedy threatened a partial blockade of Cuba. It was not an act of war, and it worked: or, it worked for the brief time that it was enforced.

That action was taken against materials of war. Foods and medicines were clearly exempted. This kind of action could well be considered now again.

Or, there is another approach. Way back in 1856 all major powers, including Russia, signed the Declaration of Paris which approved what was called a pacific blockade. In this kind of blockade a country announces that a certain coastal area is closed until a limited objective is attained.

Even earlier, in 1827, Great Britain, France, and Russia joined to use a pacific blockade to induce Turkey to enter into mediation to resolve a dispute. Since that incident a pacific blockade has had the sanction of international law.

I do not know if we could quickly or easily win the war in Vietnam by preventing ships from carrying supplies to North Vietnamese ports, but we could certainly make progress toward that goal, perhaps a great deal of progress.

We must never forget that our boys' lives are at stake, and weapons of war are coming through Haiphong daily. There is no excuse for this to continue.

I believe the American public deserves to have a statement as to why the Government is not taking action.

ADM. RICHARD H. JACKSON

(Mr. BOB WILSON (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to introduce today, at the request of the American Battleship Association, a bill to authorize the President to promote Adm. Richard H. Jackson to the honorary rank of fleet admiral.

My proposed legislation reads:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to promote Admiral Richard H. Jackson, United States Navy retired, to the honorary rank of fleet admiral.

Sec. 2. No individual shall be entitled to receive any bonus, gratuity, pay, or allowances by reason of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, this most distinguished and remarkable gentleman will be 100 years old on May 10 of this year. He is the oldest living graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and he is surprisingly active and alert, residing in Coronado, Calif., in my congressional district.

Richard Harrison Jackson was born in Tuscaloosa, Ala., on May 10, 1866, and entered the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., on appointment of the Honorable Luke Prior, of the Eighth Alabama District, on June 4, 1883. Completing the 4-year course in June 1887, he went to sea for the 2 years' service then required by law before commissioning. He served on the U.S.S. *Boston* and U.S.S. *Trenton* and on June 30, 1889, was honorably discharged from naval service. As a naval cadet, he so distinguished himself during the sinking of the *Trenton* when he devised and, with the help of other members of the crew, made a human sail that he was restored to the service, with the rank of ensign, to date from July 1, 1890, by special act of Congress dated September 26, 1890.

Receiving progressive promotions he attained the rank captain on July 11, 1915. Appointed rear admiral—temporary—on June 30, 1919, he was commissioned in that rank on June 3, 1921. He served in the rank of vice admiral from October 5, 1925, to July 24, 1926, and in that of admiral from from July 24, 1926, to July 9, 1927. Transferred to the retired list of the Navy, in the rank of rear admiral, upon reaching the statutory retirement age of 64 on May 10, 1930, he was advanced to the rank of admiral—the highest rank in which he had served—on the retired list, by congressional legislation, on June 16, 1942.

In addition, to the Navy Cross and French Legion of Honor, and the Order of Aviz by Portugal, Admiral Jackson has the Spanish Campaign Medal, the Philippine Campaign Medal, the China Relief Expedition Medal, and the World War I Victory Medal with Overseas Clasp.

This May 10 on Admiral Jackson's 100th birthday he will be honored at a banquet attended by the U.S. Navy's leading admirals. I am hopeful my colleagues will move rapidly in favorably acting on the bill I have introduced today to grant the honorary rank of fleet admiral to this wonderful gentleman, Adm. Richard H. Jackson.

CONGRESS SHOULD DEBATE THE VIETNAM WAR

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to resume bombing of North Vietnamese military targets, at

least on a limited basis, has stimulated what may develop into a full-scale debate in Congress on the conduct of this complex and frustrating war.

Such a debate is long overdue, and I welcome it. It would be especially timely and desirable now that the United Nations has agreed to debate the Vietnam issue.

Whether one supports fully the President's policies, or opposes them, or is somewhat confused and doubtful about them—which is the case with many of us here—another congressional "great debate" should be encouraged. As a nation, we are confused about the issues in Vietnam, ignorant of some of the essential facts on which wise decisions must be based, and uninformed about the courses of action that are open to us.

In such a situation, a comprehensive and candid congressional debate could do much to help clarify the issues and contribute toward an informed consensus, as opposed to an unenthusiastic acceptance of a policy we do not fully understand. At any rate, debate could do no harm, and it might develop in greater detail the facts, alternatives, and consequences we need to know. The administration only increases the risks of an already dangerous situation by relying for support on a confused and uninformed public.

To a surprising extent, Congressmen and Senators profess to feel confused and uninformed themselves, and this fact adds a serious new dimension to our dilemma when one considers that the President specifically relies on a resolution approved by Congress for the authority to conduct the war in Vietnam, not to speak of the appropriations the war requires. Congress, therefore, has a heavy obligation to inform itself and to enlighten the country.

Until more information is available, until issues are clarified, Congress and the people have little alternative but to support the President's position in the immediate circumstances. And this—despite considerable doubt and some dissent—is what most Congressmen and Senators are doing now. But Congressmen should go further and make certain that we and the people we represent are as fully informed as military security permits. Only then can a policy consensus have real meaning for a free people.

I believe that our uncertainty extends to both the ends and the means of our policy toward Vietnam. It is often assumed that Americans are united on objectives even though we may differ on the means of attaining those ends, but I am afraid we should not take this assumption for granted. It is true that most Americans, including myself, hope our policies will result in the containment of aggressive communism in southeast Asia and in the establishment of a stable and freely chosen government in Vietnam. As ideals, these goals are fine. But what do they really mean, and what do they require to be attained? Any congressional review of our policy must start here, with such fundamental questions as, How far are we prepared to go?

There is no doubt about our military capacity to win an early and total victory over North Vietnam by bombing

1992

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 1, 1966

that country virtually out of existence. But would such a victory be worthwhile if it should mean taking on the Soviet Union in a nuclear war and engaging millions of Communist Chinese troops on the mainland and in Korea—a distinct possibility raised recently by no less a strategist than Gen. James Gavin?

If we are not prepared for all-out war, can we realistically expect that our present strategy of gradual escalation will force the Communists to agree to negotiate a settlement?

If negotiations should take place, could any workable settlement be reached, given the totally opposite aims of the Communists and ourselves? How long could we expect any settlement to be maintained without the continued presence of large numbers of American troops? Or would United Nations or other international supervision be practical—or available?

If no settlement should be possible, how long would we be prepared to fight with no better prospect in view than continued military stalemate? Would anything worth saving be left of South Vietnam if fighting should continue indefinitely at the present scale?

Would General Gavin's suggestion of taking a stand in the coastal cities of South Vietnam provide a way to maintain American resistance while reducing risks and casualties to a minimum?

Could there be a better place—as some have suggested—to defend freedom in southeast Asia than Vietnam? Or would American withdrawal there result necessarily in further Communist successes in Asia?

These and other fundamental questions must be considered out in the open. Whether public debate results in added support for the administration's present position or in demands for some kind of change, we should be a stronger, more united people. While the President, of course, is constitutionally responsible for military and foreign policy decisions, it is this supplementary leadership role that Congress must now accept.

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE

(Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the record shows that Secretary of Labor Wirtz has taken the position that California agriculture did not sustain serious dislocation, or severe losses, as the result of his refusal to certify the need for substantial numbers of supplemental farm-workers during 1965. I understand he has indicated that no foreign agricultural workers will be permitted to work on California farms during 1966. Rather, the Secretary proposes to continue dependence upon a variety of sociological experiments to induce domestic workers to till the gap. The facts of the situation lead to different conclusions than those the Secretary evidently has reached, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, the able and distinguished Senator from California GEORGE MURPHY, has prepared a statement in

which he places the matter in a different perspective. I am pleased to bring his comments to the attention of my colleagues and other interested persons, and include the statement of Senator MURPHY, dated December 14, 1965, at this point in my remarks:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURPHY

Recent statements of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz concerning the California farm labor picture serve only to compound the already existing confusion which he has created. In my judgment he has misrepresented the facts and drawn misleading and unwarranted conclusions.

It is natural that I should disagree with Mr. Wirtz because he looks at the question from the standpoint of a commitment to certain labor leaders interested in increasing their ranks and in trying to justify his sociological experiment. I, on the other hand, am concerned only with the general welfare of my State and its people, as well as its largest industry, agriculture.

I am concerned with the thousands of jobs supplied by agriculture which were lost last year and which in the future may move into Mexico. I am concerned with the cost of living which continues to rise adding further strain on the already overburdened family budget.

In short, Mr. Wirtz is trying to prove a theory while I am committed to the general welfare of the people.

Since the adjournment of Congress last month, I have toured California from one end to the other meeting with farmers, large and small.

I think it is time Mr. Wirtz stopped talking theory and began talking to the farmers. He would find, as I have, that farmers everywhere are in total disagreement with his positions, policies, and statements—all of which ignore facts and dramatic evidence which is available to prove the farmer's side of the story.

If Mr. Wirtz' policies had brought employment to more American citizens and a healthier climate to our farming industry as he claims, I would indeed be delighted and join in the praise of his efforts. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The results confirm my predictions and those of leading agriculture economists, farm leaders, and even Governor Brown, who felt from the very beginning that the Wirtz plan would not work.

Based on a thorough study of the past history of California agriculture, it was obvious that supplemental workers would be needed to harvest many crops during the peak periods since there never has been enough qualified domestic workers available to do the job. Mr. Wirtz claimed he could supply these workers from the ranks of the domestic unemployed and in spite of millions of dollars spent on an unsuccessful national recruitment program, he has been proved incorrect.

I have asked for the full cost of this ill-advised recruitment program, but so far I have been unable to get any figures released from the Department of Labor.

I predicted that the dictatorial interference of the Secretary of Labor in agriculture would lead only to increases in grocery prices to the housewife. Here again we have unfortunately been proven correct.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the retail price of fresh tomatoes in the San Francisco area in October stood at 23.8 cents a pound compared with 18.2 cents a year before. This report was quoted in the Los Angeles Herald Examiner on December 2, 1965, along with a long list of other prices which are in complete disagreement with some quoted by Secretary Wirtz. As far as I am concerned, I don't believe there is a housewife anywhere in America who isn't

painfully aware that the cost of living is up.

Mr. Wirtz' recent statements have completely misrepresented what has happened to agriculture this past year. He has purposely overlooked the serious losses of crops suffered by our farmers, the thousands of acres of vegetables never planted, the increase in production costs, the exodus of many farmers seeking new locations in Mexico, and the increase in wholesale and retail prices. He also seems unaware of the fact that a great deal of California crops continue to be harvested by Mexican nationals and that the number of wetbacks in California appears to be double that of last year.

I can understand Mr. Wirtz' reluctance to point out these matters, as they completely expose the failure of his policies this year. A full examination would show that the Secretary has substituted one plan already proven unworkable for another all year long without coming up with any new or practical approach to the problem.

Instead of putting California's unemployed to work on our farms, as he originally intended, Mr. Wirtz' program has simply substituted 35,000 extra Mexican green-card workers (recorded as domestics for statistical purposes) and illegal entries (wetbacks) for those who came to the United States under the well-organized and properly supervised bracero program. Today, as in the past, Mexican workers are supplying California agriculture's supplemental manpower needs.

When Mr. Wirtz asserted that domestic farm employment was up 20,000 to 25,000 this year, he deliberately neglected to mention reliable estimates that there have been about 35,000 more green-card workers who are considered domestics. Nor did he mention that tens of thousands of wetbacks are known to have been on our farms this year. I have also been told by responsible labor leaders that Mr. Wirtz' mistakes have actually cost one union about 20,000 jobs.

A basic fact shatters all of Mr. Wirtz' contentions that his experiment was successful. The total agricultural employment in California has throughout the year been substantially less than it was last year—41,000 less, for example the week after Labor Day in spite of the 35,000 extra green-card Mexican workers which Mr. Wirtz insists on counting as domestics.

Mr. Wirtz' fantastic schemes have not provided our farmers with the workers they needed nor our expanding population with much-needed new jobs. In fact, in his attempt to eliminate unemployment he has actually eliminated jobs.

The same day Mr. Wirtz was trying to tell the housewives that he has not caused higher food prices, newspapers throughout the State were carrying a report from Sacramento under the headlines: "Bracero Ban Ups Grocery Prices." The story, dated December 2, 1965, disclosed that "California agriculture's first year without access to a large reservoir of bracero labor is nearing an end with rising consumer prices on many products already forcing housewives to stretch food budget dollars."

Commonsense alone would tell anyone that you cannot impose increased production costs and inefficiency on the farmers and lower the acreage planted without raising prices everywhere down the line, from the farm to the grocery shelves.

Mr. Wirtz admitted that the asparagus growers had suffered losses, but he blamed it on the weather "playing a trick." The fact is that nature is always unpredictable and that is exactly why we need a supplemental farm labor force ready and able to pick the crops when needed. If we had had the workers when needed for the asparagus harvest, the crop would not have been lost.

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1973

MADAM CHIANG SELLS WAR
WITH RED CHINA

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an ably written article—as his articles generally are; in fact, I know of no exception—by Richard Dudman, the Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "Madam Chiang Sells War With Red China," which appeared in the Sunday, January 30, 1966, issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADAM CHIANG SELLS WAR WITH RED CHINA

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—As the United States moves toward a decision on a new expansion of the war in southeast Asia, the possibility of war with China is little mentioned but much pondered.

Publicly, the official position can be summed up as repeated assurance that China will stay out and warning that China would come in at its own peril.

Privately, the prospect of masses of Chinese troops pouring into South Vietnam is cause for anxiety and some restraint; the bombers, for example, stay well back from the Chinese border. Among specialists in Chinese Communist affairs, the odds on Chinese entry are understood to have risen sharply.

There are a few war hawks in Congress and in the executive branch who favor carrying the war to China. They see the fighting in Vietnam as a steppingstone to an attack to knock out China's nuclear installations before they become fully operational.

Amid the worry and anxiety and occasional war cries, the voice of an important visitor from Formosa is so serene that it goes almost unnoticed. Mme. Chiang Kai-shek has been in the United States since September 6, making an occasional bland speech, meeting informally with high officials (including a 5-minute chat with President Lyndon B. Johnson at a White House tea), and avoiding press interviews.

"She has no mission here," said a spokesman for the Republic of China Embassy.

The tea at the White House was given by Mrs. Johnson shortly after Madam Chiang's arrival. The following week, Secretary of State Dean Rusk gave a dinner for her in one of the Department's eighth-floor dining rooms. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and Deputy Secretary Cyrus R. Vance also were there. Other officials have paid her courtesy calls at her suite in the Shoreham Hotel and at the house she has rented on Kalorama Road.

Officials give the impression that, since her visit is classed as unofficial, any talks with her are brief, informal and no more than social chit-chat.

Last week she spoke at the National War College before an audience of students and their wives and a sprinkling of what came to be known as the China lobby. Guests included Mrs. Claire Chennault, widow of the founder of the Flying Tigers in World War II and that line's successor, Chian Air Transport; Thomas Corcoran, who was counsel for General Chennault when he was lobbying for aid to Chiang in the late 1940's; and Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations and now director of the conservative center for strategic studies of Georgetown University. Mrs. Clare Booth Luce addressed the same forum earlier this winter.

Mme. Chiang's speech was not for publication. An officer who heard it described it as inspirational rather than getting down to the brass tacks of strategy in the Far East. He said that her approach could be described as "soft-sell."

At the Washington Wellesley Club last Saturday, she told a Biblical story that seemed to some listeners to be intended as a political allegory. She related that Joshua, who led the Jews in the wilderness, took the last choice when the land was divided among the different tribes. But the others began serving other nations and other gods and were plundered, whereas Joshua's poorer land prospered.

Her Embassy afterward expressed regret that Washington newspaper reporters had tried to read current significance into what was merely her recollection of an Old Testament story.

Behind the soft-sell, it is known that she continues to preach her version of the inevitable war with Communist China and to express her conviction that, since it must be fought sooner or later, it had better come sooner.

The administration is represented as paying no attention to this irresponsible bravery, as one rather tolerant critic calls this thesis.

Mme. Chiang's visit is the latest in a long series. She has come to the United States for stays of from several months to more than a year at critical times in the affairs of the regime on Formosa. She was in this country in 1942-1943, 1944, 1948-1950, 1954, and 1958-1959. She has not said how long her present visit will last.

Her tactics of pressure and persuasion have made both friends and enemies. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt once said of her that she "could talk very convincingly about democracy, its aims and ideals, but hasn't any idea how to live it." President Harry S. Truman refused to speak to her on an official basis when she came to Washington to woo his administration after his surprise victory over the nationalists' favorite, Thomas E. Dewey.

This time, she has escaped criticism and even much public notice. A possible reason is her unusually quiet and indirect approach. Another could be deference to her advancing age. Although the China yearbook of 1935 said she was born in 1892, she is generally thought to be about 68 years old. Her husband is 78.

More important, Formosa's time is running out as the sole representative of China in the United Nations. And there is an increasing disposition by American officials to recognize the Peiping Government whenever the war in Vietnam can be ended.

Madame Chiang's persuasive efforts may be offset this time by the appearance of a new book, "Formosa Betrayed" by George H. Kerr (Houghton Mifflin, 514 pp., \$6.95). It tells a story of tyranny and corruption in her husband's regime.

Part of the story concerns Madame Chiang and her brother, T. V. Soong, Minister of Foreign Affairs and later Premier. When the United States prepared late in World War II to put \$470 million into China aid through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency, they insisted that Chinese officials would be sole administrators of the relief program.

Kerr reports that Madame Chiang's family dominated the warehousing and shipping interests that distributed the supplies. He says that China insisted on charging \$190 million in administrative costs for distributing the donated goods.

American economic aid to Formosa has often been cited as an outstanding program. Some American officials who have seen Kerr's book complain that his firsthand observations there have not included a recent look at Formosa's success story.

His criticism of the regime is more political than economic, however. He contends that economic progress is not enough and that Formosans are restive under the domination of a regime of mainland Chinese.

American officials concede that political progress has been slower than economic progress. But they point out that Nationalist China is at war and contend that, under martial law, there can hardly be "unrestrained political progress."

Even restrained political progress is hardly the description that would fit recent incidents of political suppression cited by Kerr. He tells how the secret police, under Chiang's son and heir-apparent, Chiang Ching-kuo, harassed, beat, and executed leaders of Formosan Nationalist movements.

The regime on Formosa has shown great interest in the campaign to suppress the Vietcong and is understood to have offered repeatedly to send troops.

Although South Vietnam and the United States both have felt the need for more combat troops for counterguerrilla fighting, both have rejected the idea of bringing in Chinese Nationalists.

The reasons usually given are that any Chinese are unpopular in Vietnam and that Chinese Nationalist troops would be a new provocation to Peiping.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, we are accustomed to the invasion of foreign propagandists, from time to time, in our country. As one reads Mr. Dudman's account of the activities of Madam Chiang, she falls, in my judgment, under that category and description.

IS SEATO A TREATY ORGANIZATION
OR A FRONT FOR A WAR IN ASIA?

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, last Friday, January 28, Secretary of State Rusk appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee. A good deal of the hearing was devoted to the question of our so-called commitment to South Vietnam.

I have spoken on this subject before, but I feel that I must do so again. And I will continue to speak out as long as the administration continues to misrepresent and misstate the legalities, not to mention the moralities, involved in our war in South Vietnam.

In his opening statement to the Committee, Secretary Rusk said:

The United States has a clear and direct commitment to the security of Vietnam against external attack.

The Secretary was then asked what the origin and basis was for this clear and direct commitment. He began his reply by referring to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. He was asked: "Does the treaty commit us to do what we are doing now in Vietnam?" He replied that he had "no doubt that it does." He went on to say that "a protocol states has a right to call on the members of the organization for assistance" and that "there seems to be no doubt that we are entitled to offer that assistance." Later, he said that the policy of the treaty was that we are opposed to aggression against the countries of southeast Asia. I said at this point in the hearing that I disagreed with virtually every major premise in the Secretary's prepared statement and in the subsequent remarks of the Secretary that had taken place at the hearing. I noted that I disagreed, in particular, with his interpretation of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. I will now turn to the reasons for my statement of disagreement last Friday.

1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 3, 1966

TERMS OF SEATO TREATY

I have been over this ground several times before and will not impose on the time of Senators by beginning again at the beginning. Suffice it to say that the heart of the treaty is article IV which states the obligations of the parties when direct or indirect aggression occurs.

Paragraph one of article IV states that if there is "aggression by means of armed attack" against any of the parties or the protocol states—and South Vietnam is a protocol state—each party will then "act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes." This is the first sentence of paragraph No. 1. The second and final sentence of paragraph 1 is also important. It states that "measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations."

Paragraph 2 of article IV refers to the case where "in the opinion of any of the parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any party" or any protocol state "is threatened in any way other than by armed attack." In this case, paragraph 2 continues, "the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense."

UNDER WHAT SEATO LANGUAGE DOES VIETNAM FALL?

Now when the treaty first came into existence, the war going on in South Vietnam was considered to be a threat by other than armed attack. In other words, the war was considered to be a situation described in paragraph 2. The late Secretary of State Dulles, the originator of the treaty, made this plain on several occasions. Testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Dulles summed up the meaning of the "commitment" in paragraph 2 in these words: "That is an obligation for consultation. It is not an obligation for action."

Hence, under paragraph 2 there is no commitment to take any action vis-a-vis South Vietnam. There is an obligation to consult the other parties to the treaty but, let me emphasize, South Vietnam is not a party to the treaty. There is clearly not a commitment to defend South Vietnam with American Armed Forces.

Now, Secretary Rusk might want to argue that it is not paragraph 2 but paragraph 1 that applies at present in South Vietnam. I say that he might so argue because I do not know whether or not he would. To the best of my knowledge, he has never stated publicly whether he views our commitment to South Vietnam to arise from paragraph 1 or from paragraph 2. When this question was discussed last Friday, he referred to North Vietnam's moving the 325th North Vietnamese Division into South Vietnam in late 1964 and early 1965. He did not come right out and say that this constituted "aggression by means of armed attack." He has not used this important phrase, so far as I am aware.

Nor has this phrase, which is required to bring paragraph 1 into effect, ever appeared in a SEATO communique. The communique issued on May 6, 1965, at the conclusion of the last SEATO Council meeting in London mentioned "Communist aggression" but not "aggression by means of armed attack."

If the United States considers that its commitment to South Vietnam under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty arises from paragraph 1 of article IV, I think that we and the rest of the American people are entitled to know it. We are entitled to be told in no uncertain terms. We cannot be expected to divine whether our legal commitment is only to consult or whether it is to take action in accordance with our constitutional processes. It is incumbent on Secretary Rusk to make an unequivocal statement on this point. And I ask for it tonight.

It is astonishing to me that the administration is leading this country into full-scale war without ever identifying the nature and language of the commitment they claim to be following.

Our commitment cannot be two different things. If our present commitment to South Vietnam is pursuant to paragraph 2, it is a commitment only to consult and the situation we are facing is not "aggression by means of armed attack." If our commitment falls under paragraph 1 there must be "aggression by means of armed attack" and someone in this administration must so state.

NO UNILATERAL COMMITMENT UNDER SEATO

Even if Secretary Rusk had made such a statement, and had said that we were acting under paragraph 1, we would not have a unilateral commitment to defend South Vietnam. In the first place, paragraph 1 of article IV speaks of a "common danger," which certainly implies collective judgment by those who share the common danger and, second, a common response to that danger.

The most recent SEATO communique does not state any finding of common danger. Could SEATO members meet and ignore a common danger governed by their treaty organization? Not if this is really a collective defense organization.

If the Secretary wants to argue that SEATO is not a collective defense mechanism at all, but only a misrepresented hook on which to hang American military intervention anywhere in southeast Asia, let him proceed to make that case.

Certainly in terms of response, there is no agreement in SEATO that there is a common danger governed by paragraph 1 of article IV. There are eight members of the SEATO. We, the Australians, and the New Zealanders are the only members with forces in the field. We have huge forces, and they have, in comparison, token forces. The most significant military assistance we have received has come from South Korea which is not even a member of SEATO and is, of course, an American military dependency. The other five members have contributed only troops. One member, France, has publicly criticized our actions in South Vietnam.

As to South Korea, let me point out

that we maintain more American soldiers there to protect South Korea against the North Koreans than South Korea has sent to Vietnam.

In the second place, we should keep clearly in mind the fact that under paragraph one we have no commitment to defend South Vietnam with our armed forces. South Vietnam is a protocol state but not a member of SEATO. An "attack by means of armed aggression" against its territory falls within the area covered by the Southeast Asia Treaty. If such an attack occurs, the parties have an obligation to act to meet the common danger in accordance with their constitutional processes. The danger involved, under paragraph one, is the danger to the "peace and safety" of each of the parties. This is quite a different thing from a commitment to defend by armed force a protocol state against aggression.

CONFLICT WITH U.N. CHARTER

Finally, I would point out that if we are currently acting under paragraph one we are violating both the treaty itself and the U.N. Charter. We are violating the treaty itself because paragraph one requires that "measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations." We have not reported our Vietnam war measures to the Security Council. We have had various communications with the President of the Security Council and with the Secretary General, but none of these communications has been identified as a report of measures taken under paragraph one of article IV of the Southeast Asia Treaty.

Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to point out that my President and my Ambassador to the United Nations, and the President and the Ambassador of 180 million people, are not acting to meet the requirements of this treaty. They are not acting to meet the requirements of the United Nations Charter, by sending Arthur Goldberg to New York City to carry on some conversations behind the scenes in the United Nations, either with U Thant, or with the President of the United Nations, or with various delegates to the United Nations.

That does not amount to taking the issue of Vietnam to the United Nations. Yet they have succeeded in some quarters in giving the impression to the American people that, prior to the action we took the other day in regard to Vietnam, we had taken our cause to the United Nations.

We have been derelict in taking our cause to the United Nations.

We have been in violation of the United Nations Charter for the past several years.

I am glad that at long last my Government has finally sent a resolution to the Security Council, asking the Security Council to proceed to assume its legal obligations under the United Nations Charter.

I regret, and am saddened, that my Government went to the United Nations with an olive branch in one hand and bombs in the other.

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1975

By so doing we have greatly weakened our cause in the United Nations; and we ask for the international criticism that we are getting because of our course of conduct in Vietnam.

But let me tell the Senate of one chapter in the history of illegal acts on the part of the United States in southeast Asia that we should have reported to the Security Council but have not reported—that is the building up of a privileged U.S. military sanctuary in Thailand. We are turning Thailand into a military dependency of the United States. From this sanctuary, in violation of our international obligations, we have been bombing South Vietnam and Laos for many months past.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate and some members of the administration are not happy when I call my country an outlaw nation for its violations of international law in southeast Asia, but we have convicted ourselves by our own illegal acts. The building up of an American military sanctuary in Thailand is no more justified than is the building up of military sanctuaries by Communist nations anywhere in Asia or elsewhere in the world.

It is always interesting to me that so many in our own country, who think so much better of themselves than the rest of the world thinks of us, are willing to ignore our own transgressions and seek to fix attention on the transgressions of our enemies. We have not, under the terms of the SEATO Treaty, lived up to our obligations to report our activities to the Security Council.

Therefore, we are violating the U.N. Charter whether we are acting in South Vietnam under paragraph 1 or under paragraph 2. In either case, we are violating article 2, paragraph 4, of the charter which states that "all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force." We have violated article 33 of the charter which requires that parties to a dispute "shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their choice" and note that article 33 requires that these steps be taken "first of all."

I repeat it—article 33 requires that these steps be taken "first of all."

Mr. President, I am saddened by the fact that history will record that my Government did not take those steps first of all, and convicted herself of being a violator of the United Nations Charter.

We have violated article 37, which states that "should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that article, they shall refer it to the Security Council." We have violated article 39, which states that "the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression." If we are invoking SEATO, we have and are violating article 53 of the United Nations Charter which states that "no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional

agencies without the authorization of the Security Council."

From the floor of the Senate tonight, Mr. President, I ask you: When did you, as Commander in Chief, ask for Security Council authorization for us to engage in armed conflict in southeast Asia under SEATO? Neither President Johnson nor Dean Rusk nor McNamara can erase the indelible language of the United Nations Charter, and that language is binding on us as well as on every other signatory to the charter.

Some of my colleagues and some people in the administration do not like it because I point out that our hands are not clean. Let me say that sometimes the United Nations is referred to as a tribunal of equity. I used to teach my law students that old doctrine of equity that one appears before a court of equity, if one expects to have equity done, only with clean hands.

The sad thing is that the United States cannot appear before the United Nations with clean hands, so far as our violations of the charter are concerned. It is important that we wash them. That is why I believe it is so laudable that at long last we are before the United Nations. We must accept a considerable amount of criticism, because we have it coming to us.

I would not have my ambassador hesitate to see to it that others with unclean hands have their records spread open in the United Nations.

But this stage must be put behind us. The record will have to be made against us, against our enemies, and against our potential enemies. Then the members of the United Nations must settle down, in my judgment, and reach an understanding as to how we can best bring an end to a war in southeast Asia which by the day is increasing the threat of a third world war.

For many months past I have urged that the Security Council—or in the case of a veto, the General Assembly—consider a recommendation that the members of the Geneva Conference of 1954 reconvene and seek to arrive at an arrangement whereby they can implement and effectuate the basic tenets of the Geneva accords of 1954. At long last—although for many months our administration would not hear of it—our Government now indicates that it would be willing to consider these accords.

Arthur Goldberg is now saying that if the United Nations would agree to do that, we would be at Geneva tomorrow.

This means, of course, that we would have to sit down with the Communists. What a change. This means, of course, that there would be a reconvening of the Geneva Conference. This means that there would have to be a recognition of another basic truism of international law, and that is that a Communist nation has exactly the same sovereign rights under international law as a free nation.

In spite of all the hysteria and war propaganda that is stalking this country and misleading many Americans, let us face up to the fact that we cannot wishfully think Communists and their governments off the face of the earth. Nor can we bomb them off the face of the

earth. We can win military victories over them, but that will never give us peace.

The objective should be to lead mankind toward peace and not toward war, even though through war we might gain some surrenders.

So I am again pleading tonight, Mr. President, that my country recognize how important it is that we do everything we can to try to have the Geneva Conference reconvened in order to carry out the basic tenets of the 1954 accords.

When will my Government face up to the fact that the Geneva accords of 1954 not only did not provide for two governments in Vietnam, but literally prohibited it? It was pointed out in the language of the accords that the 17th parallel was only a demarcation between two military zones; that the French military were to repair to the south of the 17th parallel while the Viet Minh would remain in the north; and that then, for the next 2 years, under the direction of the International Control Commission, consultations would take place leading to an application of the principle of self-determination in July 1956, by way of a free election supervised by the International Control Commission.

The sordid, black, unfortunate chapter of American history that we wrote at that time will plague future generations of Americans because we stopped that election. We not only stopped that election but we, the United States, set up a puppet government in South Vietnam and by so doing we clearly violated the Geneva accords.

I have been reading with great interest the discussions of our spokesmen about our willingness now to see a reconvening of the Geneva Conference and the implementation and the effectuation of the agreements reached in 1954.

I wonder if they recognize the challenge that is going to be made to our action in violating the Geneva accords by taking Diem out of New York and Washington, D.C., sending him to South Vietnam, financing him, militarizing him, and creating a government there to serve our interests.

All they have to do is listen to the criticisms of us in New York City these days or go with me across Asia, and it will soon be discovered that all of the rest of the world seems to know this except the American people. Then, there will be the job of concealing from the American people the ugly facts about our unfortunate military policy in southeast Asia.

In this stormy weather in Washington, D.C., I can think of no more descriptive term than to say once again that a "snow job" has been done on the thinking of the American people.

No, Mr. President: we have violated section after section of the United Nations Charter in regard to our illegalities.

If we are invoking SEATO, we have and are violating article 53 which states:

No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

And we are violating article 103 which states:

1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 3, 1967

In the event of a conflict between the obligations of members of the United Nations under the present charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present charter shall prevail.

Incidentally, this principle of the primacy of the U.N. Charter is reiterated in article VI. of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. And article I of the treaty states:

The parties undertake, as set forth in the charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means.

REFERRAL TO U.N.

In his news conference of January 31, Secretary Rusk said that the time had come to meet the requirements of "paragraph 1 of article IV of the Southeast Asia Treaty itself to report this present situation to the Security Council." Here for the first time, we find the Secretary referring specifically to paragraph 1 of article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. But he still does not say that we are now fighting in South Vietnam under paragraph 1, and not paragraph 2, though that is the clear implication. At any rate, we are obeying the spirit if not the letter of the obligation in paragraph 1 to report the measures being taken to the Security Council after fighting there for some 2 years without doing it. I say that we are not obeying the letter of the law in this case because, as I have pointed out, paragraph 1 requires that the measures being taken under its authority shall be immediately reported to the Security Council. We have certainly not made this report immediately and "better late than never" is hardly a principle of international law.

Now that we have referred the situation in Vietnam to the Security Council, our violations of articles 33 and 37 of the U.N. Charter are no longer as blatant. We are finally seeking a solution to the dispute by mediation or arbitration, as article 33 obliges us to. We have not done this "first of all" as article 33 requires, but at least we have made a gesture in this direction. By referring the dispute to the Security Council on January 31, we are finally complying with our obligation under article 37 of the charter.

I am, of course, pleased to see this matter referred to the United Nations. I have been urging this course of action since March of 1964, and I am distressed that it has taken the administration so long to realize what our obligations are to the U.N. Charter.

Secretary's Rusk's assertions that we have a "clear and direct commitment" to South Vietnam under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty are feeble, vague, and unconvincing. In fact, we have no commitment to them for they are not a party to the treaty. What commitment we do have, is to the other parties to the treaty. It is either to consult with them, if we are acting under paragraph 2 of article IV of the treaty, or to act with them to meet the common danger if paragraph 1 applies. What we have done in South Vietnam is to intervene unilaterally when we are by no means committed to do so.

BALL MISREPRESENTATIONS OF SEATO

In a speech at Northwestern University last Sunday, Undersecretary George Ball further obfuscated our position by saying of the SEATO Treaty:

Under that treaty and its protocol, the United States and other treaty partners gave their joint and several pledges to guarantee existing boundaries—including the line of demarcation between North and South Vietnam established when the French relinquished their control over Indochina.

This is, too, a gross misstatement of our commitment under the SEATO Treaty. There is nothing in this treaty which says that we or our treaty partners pledged to "guarantee existing boundaries" anywhere—and George Ball knows it. Contrary to Mr. Ball's distorted interpretation, we certainly did not commit ourselves to maintain a permanently divided Vietnam.

Once again, Mr. Ball has fallen into the pit which the administration digs for itself every time it tries to endorse the 1954 Geneva agreement and an independent South Vietnam at one and the same time. The two assertions are totally contradictory.

Under the 1954 Geneva agreements which ended the war in Indochina the division of Vietnam at the 17th parallel was a "provisional military demarcation" line.

The final declaration of that conference states that this line "should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." The final declaration went on to spell out that the "military demarcation line" was to be obliterated through unification elections to be held throughout Vietnam in July 1956. We all know why these elections were not held as promised: Because Diem and we knew that no non-Communist leader could hope to equal Ho Chi Minh at the ballot box.

To say that a divided Vietnam is guaranteed under SEATO will not strike Hanoi or Peiping as being unusual. It only proves what the Communists have been saying all along: that despite the words of President Johnson that we support the 1954 agreement, the United States has no intention of carrying out its principles and that our real objective is to maintain a divided Vietnam with an American puppet government in South Vietnam. It is little wonder that the Communists doubt our intentions. When we use doubletalk in stating our policies—as George Ball did when he spoke at Northwestern University last Sunday—that we support a return to the 1954 Geneva agreements and at the same time say that under SEATO we are committed to a divided Vietnam—there is no question about which line they will believe.

Either we support the 1954 agreements—designed to create a unified Vietnam—or we do not. The State Department's position on this point, like its policies in Vietnam generally, are ambiguous, deceptive and, although calculated to fool our own citizens, the free world, and the other side, really fool no one. But they destroy the credibility of this Government. Until the State Depart-

ment and the President begin to be honest with themselves and the people there is little hope for achieving peace through the United Nations or any other means. As a first step I suggest that they hire a few people who can read the plain English in the 1954 agreements and the SEATO treaty. It does not take a Philadelphia lawyer to read them—but it does take more than the abilities of the best international lawyer in Philadelphia to make legal sense out of the State Department's position.

Undersecretary of State Ball has often been described as the leading dove in the Department of State. In the light of what Mr. Ball said at Northwestern University last Sunday, he looks more to me like a dove in hawk's feathers, unless he is a pigeon.

There was a sharp and militant edge to Mr. Ball's remarks last Sunday. He described the alliances and commitments of this country as "a barrier around the whole periphery of the Communist world." He said that the battles our soldiers and marines are fighting in South Vietnam are "skirmishes in a continuing war to prevent one Communist power after another from violating internationally recognized boundary lines fixing the outer limits of Communist dominion." He referred to the "cynical and systematic aggression by the North Vietnamese regime" and called it "one further chapter of the long and brutal chronicle of Communist efforts to extend the periphery of Communist power by force and terror." This is hardly the language of temperance. It is the same kind of name-calling that we constantly accuse our adversaries of adopting. It is not the language of statesmanship. It is evidence of emotionalism and subjectivity when dispassion and reason are needed.

I gather from Mr. Ball's remarks that he feels that the United States has a holy writ to fix the geographic limits beyond which communism will not be permitted. Do we grant our adversaries the same right? What if the course of events had proceeded differently in Indonesia and the Indonesian Communist Party, which was the third largest Communist Party in the world, had succeeded in establishing a Communist government in that country? Would that have been beyond the "outer limits" Secretary Ball mentioned? What about the new nations of Africa? Are they beyond the outer limits, are they outside the "barrier around the whole periphery of the Communist world" to which Mr. Ball referred last Sunday?

Simply stated, we are fighting a unilateral war in Vietnam that is militarily impractical, politically foolish, and morally indefensible. It must be stopped before the virulent language and the deception practiced by both sides renders all peaceful solutions impossible.

I know that there are those, even some Members of this body, who take the position that we who criticize the foreign policy of our Government are in some way letting down the boys who are fighting in South Vietnam.

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1977

Those of us who are trying to change the foreign policy course of our Government, in order to bring this Government's policy back into the framework of the Constitution of the United States, are seeking to bring an end to the killing of our boys in South Vietnam. We are seeking to prevent the development of a situation in which tens upon tens of thousands, and perhaps millions, of our boys will be sent into a massive war in Asia, to die unjustifiably and unnecessarily.

Therefore, Mr. President, the issue is being drawn as to whether the administration is to be continued to be supported in the conduct of this illegal and unconstitutional war, or whether, at long last, we shall adopt a foreign policy that will amount, in fact, to the substitution of the rule of law for America's jungle law of military force in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of the SEATO Treaty, and the text of the Geneva accords.

There being no objection the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

15. SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY AND PROTOCOL THERETO, SEPTEMBER 8, 1954¹

TEXT OF TREATY

The Parties to this Treaty.

Recognizing the sovereign equality of all the Parties,

Reiterating their faith in the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments,

Reaffirming that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, they uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and declaring that they will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities,

Desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace and freedom and to uphold the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law, and to promote the economic well-being and development of all peoples in the treaty area,

Intending to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity, so that any potential aggressor will appreciate that the Parties stand together in the area, and

Desiring further to coordinate their efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security,

Therefore agree as follows:

Article I

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Article II

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and

collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

Article III

The Parties undertake to strengthen their free institutions and to cooperate with one another in the further development of economic measures, including technical assistance, designed both to promote economic progress and social well-being and to further the individual and collective efforts of governments toward these ends.

Article IV

1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the treaty area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.

3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any State designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this Article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

Article V

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall provide for consultation with regard to military and any other planning as the situation obtaining in the treaty area may from time to time require. The Council shall be so organized as to be able to meet at any time.

Article VI

This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of any of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third party is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagements in conflict with this Treaty.

Article VII

Any other State in a position to further the objectives of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the area may, by unanimous agreement of the Parties, be invited to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. The Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

Article VIII

As used in this Treaty, the "treaty area" is the general area of Southeast Asia, including also the entire territories of the Asian Parties, and the general area of the South-

west Pacific not including the Pacific area north of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude. The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, amend this Article to include within the treaty area the territory of any State acceding to this Treaty in accordance with Article VII or otherwise to change the treaty area.

Article IX

1. This Treaty shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that government to the other signatories.

2. The Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which shall notify all of the other signatories of such deposit.

3. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the instruments of ratification of a majority of the signatories shall have been deposited, and shall come into effect with respect to each other State on the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Article X

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely, but any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which shall inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

Article XI

The English text of this Treaty is binding on the Parties, but when the Parties have agreed to the French text thereof and have so notified the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, the French text shall be equally authentic and binding on the Parties.

UNDERSTANDING OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The United States of America in executing the present Treaty does so with the understanding that its recognition of the effect of aggression and armed attack and its agreement with reference thereto in Article IV, paragraph 1, apply only to Communist aggression but affirms that in the event of other aggression or armed attack it will consult under the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2.

In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done at Manila, this eighth day of September, 1954.

For Australia:

R. G. CASEY

For France:

G. LA CHAMBRE

For New Zealand:

CLIFFTON WEBB

For Pakistan:

Signed for transmission to my Government for its consideration and action in accordance with the Constitution of Pakistan.

ZAFRULLA KHAN

For the Republic of the Philippines:

CARLOS P. GARCIA

FRANCISCO A. DELGADO

TOMAS L. CABILI

LORENZO M. TAÑADA

CORNELIO T. VILLAREAL

For the Kingdom of Thailand:

WAN WAITHAYAKON KROMMUN NARAD-

HIP BONGSPRABANDH

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

READING

For the United States of America:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

H. ALEXANDER SMITH

MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD

¹ 6 UST 81; Treaties and Other International Acts Series 8170.

1978

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 3, 1966

I CERTIFY THAT the foregoing is a true copy of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty concluded and signed in the English language at Manila, on September 8, 1954, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, L. RAUL S. MANGLAPUS, Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Philippines, have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Department of Foreign Affairs to be affixed at the City of Manila, this 14th day of October, 1954.

[SEAL]

Raul S. Manglapus

RAUL S. MANGLAPUS

Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs

PROTOCOL TO THE SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY

Designation of states and territory as to which provisions of article IV and article III are to be applicable

The Parties to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty unanimously designate for the purposes of Article IV of the Treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam.

The Parties further agree that the above mentioned states and territory shall be eligible in respect of the economic measures contemplated by Article III.

This Protocol shall enter into force simultaneously with the coming into force of the Treaty.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Protocol to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty.

Done at Manila, this eighth day of September, 1954.

12. FINAL DECLARATION OF GENEVA CONFERENCE, JULY 21, 1954¹

Final declaration, dated July 21, 1954, of the Geneva Conference on the problem of restoring peace in Indo-China, in which the representatives of Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, France, Laos, the People's Republic of China, the State of Viet-Nam, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America took part.

1. The Conference takes note of the agreements ending hostilities in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam and organizing international control and the supervision of the execution of the provisions of these agreements.

2. The Conference expresses satisfaction at the ending of hostilities in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam; the Conference expresses its conviction that the execution of the provisions set out in the present declaration and in the agreements on the cessation of hostilities will permit Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam henceforth to play their part, in full independence and sovereignty, in the peaceful community of nations.

3. The Conference takes note of the declarations made by the Governments of Cam-

¹IC/43/Rev. 2, 21 July 1954, Original: French.

bodia and of Laos of their intention to adopt measures permitting all citizens to take their place in the national community, in particular by participating in the next general elections, which, in conformity with the constitution of each of these countries, shall take place in the course of the year 1955, by secret ballot and in conditions of respect for fundamental freedoms.

4. The Conference takes note of the clauses in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam prohibiting the introduction into Viet-Nam of foreign troops and military personnel as well as of all kinds of arms and munitions. The Conference also takes note of the declarations made by the Governments of Cambodia and Laos of their resolution not to request foreign aid, whether in war material, in personnel or in instructors except for the purpose of the effective defence of their territory and, in the case of Laos, to the extent defined by the agreements on the cessation of hostilities in Laos.

5. The Conference takes note of the clauses in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam to the effect that no military base under the control of a foreign State may be established in the regrouping zones of the two parties, the latter having the obligation to see that the zones allotted to them shall not constitute part of any military alliance and shall not be utilized for the resumption of hostilities or in the service of an aggressive policy. The Conference also takes note of the declarations of the Governments of Cambodia and Laos to the effect that they will not join in any agreement with other States if this agreement includes the obligation to participate in a military alliance not in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations or, in the case of Laos, with the principles of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Laos, or so long as their security is not threatened, the obligation to establish bases on Cambodian or Laotian territory for the military forces of foreign Powers.

6. The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Viet-Nam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary. The Conference expresses its conviction that the execution of the provisions set out in the present declaration and in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities creates the necessary basis for the achievement in the near future of a political settlement in Viet-Nam.

7. The Conference declares that, so far as Viet-Nam is concerned, the settlement of political problems, effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity, shall permit the Viet-Nam people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot. In order to ensure that sufficient progress in the restoration of peace has been made, and that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will, general elec-

tions shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission composed of representatives of the Member States of the International Supervisory Commission, referred to in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities. Consultations will be held on this subject between the competent representative authorities of the two zones from 20 July 1955 onwards.

8. The provisions of the agreements on the cessation of hostilities intended to ensure the protection of individuals and of property must be most strictly applied and must, in particular, allow everyone in Viet-Nam to decide freely in which zone he wishes to live.

9. The competent representative authorities of the Northern and Southern zones of Viet-Nam, as well as the authorities of Laos and Cambodia, must not permit any individual or collective reprisals against persons who have collaborated in any way with one of the parties during the war, or against members of such persons' families.

10. The Conference takes note of the declaration of the Government of the French Republic to the effect that it is ready to withdraw its troops from the territory of Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam, at the request of the governments concerned and within periods which shall be fixed by agreement between the parties except in the cases where, by agreement between the two parties, a certain number of French troops shall remain at specified points and for a specified time.

11. The Conference takes note of the declaration of the French Government to the effect that for the settlement of all the problems connected with the re-establishment and consolidation of peace in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam, the French Government will proceed from the principle of respect for the independence and sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam.

12. In their relations with Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam, each member of the Geneva Conference undertakes to respect the sovereignty, the independence, the unity and the territorial integrity of the above-mentioned states, and to refrain from any interference in their internal affairs.

13. The members of the Conference agree to consult one another on any question which may be referred to them by the International Supervisory Commission in order to study such measures as may prove necessary to ensure that the agreements on the cessation of hostilities in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam are respected.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at (5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, February 4, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

While we do not think right-to-work laws are the final answer to the problems of employers and employees, we believe it gives workers some chance to regain control over how their unions are to be run.

It is interesting to note some of the points which I discussed earlier. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] has been kind enough to remain in the Chamber while I have been discussing this subject. I am certain the Senator recalls that I said a good number of union members did not want section 14(b) repealed because they felt that section 14(b) was of help to them in maintaining control over their own union officers.

I have a good many other editorials. I have editorials from almost every section of the State. I am certain that if we continue in this determined effort to educate everyone on the real problems concerning this bill, I shall have an opportunity to speak in the Senate again and discuss some of the problems.

I do not wish to speak further at this time because I believe that enough of one voice in one day is probably advisable. I shall have another opportunity. I assure Senators and anyone else who reads the RECORD that if we ever reach the point where amendments are offered to the bill, I shall be fighting for the amendments which I discussed today. I will be fighting to get a record vote on it so that we can determine whether or not the Senate intends to protect the labor leaders and also try to do something for the workingman within the unions.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEED FOR DEBATE ON VIETNAM WAR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I intend to comment on two points, and then to renew the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, because the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] advises me that it was his intention to obtain a live quorum so Senators might be advised in that regard.

I ask the Senate to give its most serious consideration to the question of whether there should be a debate in Congress on the purpose and policy of U.S. participation in the actions in Vietnam, the so-called Vietnam war. In my judgment, we have most intelligent light cast on that subject by a column, written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, one of the most respected commentators in this country, from today's New York Herald Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN A DEAD-END STREET
(By Walter Lippmann)

In saying that under the joint resolution of August 7, 1964, he has full authority from Congress "to take all necessary steps" in Vietnam, the President left himself in the position of a man relying on the letter of the bond, regardless of what it meant at the time it was written. There is no doubt that that language of the resolution gives him a blank check. But there is no doubt also that when the blank check was voted in August 1964, it was voted to a man engaged in a campaign for the Presidency against Senator Goldwater, who was advocating substantially the same military policy that President Johnson is now following. Therefore, if laws are to be interpreted in the light of their legislative history, the President is without legal and moral authority to fill in the blank check of August 1964, with whatever he thinks he ought to do in 1966.

It is, of course, impossible to rescind the resolution of August 1964. But as a matter of fact the actions of the administration go far beyond the original meaning of the resolution of 1964. This is the positive reason why the objectives and the conduct of the greatly enlarged war should be examined and debated before we are led into a still greater war.

It ought not to be necessary to press this point in a country dedicated to government by due process of law. A President who finds that his powers are challenged by responsible leaders of his own party and of the opposition would not refuse debate. He would not pretend that briefings are a substitute for debate. He would insist upon debate and welcome it. For only by refusing to rely upon the letter of the law would he be acting according to its spirit.

It is wrong to keep using the blank check while many of those who voted for it in 1964 now say—and historically they are indubitably right—that the resolution does not mean what the President is making it mean in 1966. It is also unwise to stretch the letter of the law this way. For the country is deeply and dangerously divided about the war in Vietnam, and in the trying days to come this division will grow deeper if the President rejects the only method by which a free nation can heal such a division—responsible and informed debate.

There are two principal difficulties in holding such a debate. About one of these we hear a great deal; namely, that our adversary will take heart from the speeches and newspaper articles and be confirmed in his view that the United States will not stay the course but will pack up and go home. Undoubtedly the dissent here at home does give comfort to the enemy abroad.

But the remedy for this disadvantage cannot be to silence dissent. For the dissent cannot be silenced. It would be a delusion to suppose that this dissent has its source in the minds of a few Senators and of some publicists. It has its source among a great mass of the American people who simply are not persuaded that the war in Vietnam is in fact the defense of a vital interest of the United States.

Nations do not fight indefinitely if they are not convinced that their own vital interests are at stake. Although the Korean war began under much better legal and moral auspices than did our entanglement in Vietnam, the American people came to hate the Korean war. The reason for that was that they did not believe that the interests of America in Korea on the Asian mainland were great enough to justify the casualties that were being suffered.

The other principal difficulty in uniting the country behind a national purpose in Indochina is that the President's diplomatic advisers have never defined our national pur-

pose except in the vaguest, most ambiguous generalities about aggression and freedom. The country could be united—in the preponderate mass—on a policy which rested on a limited strategy and on limited political objectives. It cannot be united on a policy of trading American lives for Asian lives on the mainland of Asia in order to make General Ky or his successor the ruler of all of South Vietnam. The division of the country will simply grow worse as the casualties and the costs increase and the attainment of our aims and the end of the fighting continue to elude us.

The revision of our policy in Vietnam—the revision of our strategy and our political purposes and plans—is the indispensable condition of a really united country and of an eventual truce abroad. Gestures, propaganda, public relations, and bombing and more bombing, will not work. Without a revision of the policy—or of our war aims as stated by Secretary Rusk, of our military strategy as approved by Secretary McNamara—the President will find that he is in a dead-end street.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with respect to the struggle in Vietnam, I have not always found myself to be of the same view as Mr. Lippmann. I said on the floor of the Senate last Friday, and repeat now, that the allocation of resources in the presently contemplated order of magnitude is well worth the struggle in Vietnam, for, in Vietnam, we have a real opportunity to save another place for self-determination and for freedom from Communist dictatorship. It can be something of a demonstration to Asia of the greater efficacy of the ways of freedom, in the nature of bringing about higher standards of living.

But the important thing about Mr. Lippmann's piece today, with which I thoroughly agree, is that he emphasizes, as I have emphasized, as one who has supported the President's policy, that the President should seek congressional debate by asking for a new resolution. That we ought to have now. That goes for those who are supporting the President and those who are opposing him. Both sides should agree that this is the thing to do. Most of all, I urge the President to say that this is his course.

In my judgment, the administration is making a fundamental mistake in getting into a battle with Congress about whether Congress should have a debate on the Vietnam war. The President has everything to gain in terms of the crystallization of the overwhelming sentiment of the country behind him, because he intends only a limited strategy, limited political objective, and limited commitments. I believe that is the consensus of the Nation.

The only conceivable objection, if there can be one, is that the debate will produce some contrary views. But contrary views are being produced by the hour now. Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow are using their propaganda to the full, and they do not compare with a decisive vote in favor of American policy that the Senate and House would debate to that end. I am confident, and I believe the President has every reason to be confident, that such a debate would be fruitful.

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

As we said earlier, Presidents—and Congresses—are paid to solve problems like this. And they usually have to do it by working out some compromise.

We might suggest compromisers take a look at Colorado's Labor Peace Act. It has worked rather well in this State. It might provide a way, short of outright repeal to settle the controversy over section 14(b).

That is an interesting one, because, as time went on, and as the debate continued, the Denver Post became less and less certain that this was something which was not of any particular importance, but that the timing was wrong in bringing it up.

I have here some of its other editorials. Here is one dated July 28, 1965, also from the Denver Post, headed "Strange Bedfellows in 14(b) Repeal."

It starts by saying:

It is too bad the old legislative device of log-rolling has reared its head in the controversial House vote on repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is a proposal to nullify the right-to-work laws which, in 19 States, bar the union shop.

Then it goes on:

The issue is so charged with emotion—not only by some employers but by people who believe they should not be forced to join a union under any circumstance—that repeal would be more palatable if it were considered strictly on its merits.

According to usually credible Washington sources, it is a strange swap between Midwestern farm bloc Congressmen and the northeastern labor bloc which is bringing 14(b) repeal within sight of success.

The administration's farm bill—attacked widely by bakers, unions, and consumer groups—is none too popular because it is expected to boost the price of bread to consumers.

Many big city lawmakers are thus cool to this bread tax. But they also want to please their union constituents so they're scratching the farm bloc's itch for higher farm support prices. In turn, the farm bloc is providing what one source called "a vital 25 votes" for the 14(b) repeal.

That, of course, is politics as it is practiced. But it is not going to be any monument to congressional statesmanship. There are a number of union abuses that need correction just as badly as the unions feel they need the repeal of 14(b). One amendment to the 14(b) repealer, for example, would have restricted the use of union dues for political purposes. That, as one might guess, got nowhere.

As we have said before, labor legislation is in an area where national uniformity is good. But 14(b), in practice, has not worked any great hardship and has served as a valuable counterweight in the system of checks and balances which keeps the relationship between the unions and the public a healthy one.

As I say, that was in July; and the editorials grow stronger and stronger as time goes on. I have several more from the Denver Post.

Finally, I believe the attitude at the present time, although I do not know that we have had an example in the past few days, may be said to be, "Why does not the Senate get this matter over with; they know very well they are not going to pass this bill; why do they not get into other subjects which are so important to the American people?"

In other words, they are recognizing that the country as a whole does not

want this legislation. Many union members do not want it, and perhaps union leaders do not want it.

I do not wish to alienate any portion of my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point to have printed in the RECORD an editorial dated August 31, 1965, from the Denver Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN USE THE RUBLES

President Johnson has announced plans to allow American wheat to be shipped to Russia and other Communist nations in foreign vessels, thus opening up a new market for American grain.

The Russians need the wheat, and we have the grain—some 800 million bushels in surplus—to sell. The effect can only be good business for the United States.

Wheat exports to Russia haven't exactly been forbidden. President John F. Kennedy authorized such shipments in 1963, but pressure by American labor unions caused him to modify the order to require half the shipments to be made in American vessels.

This was ridiculous, as most people knew. American vessels charge about twice as much to carry freight as do the shipping firms of other nations. The result was curtailment of the program; the United States sold only half as much wheat to Russia as had been planned.

For various reasons—adverse shipping arrangements with foreign shipping cartels, but primarily the stranglehold unions have on U.S. shipping—American ship lines just aren't competitive. Our merchant marine is smaller than it was in 1939 when world trade was much smaller in volume.

President Johnson has thus recognized a reality in the shipping industry. He has also made the obvious decision that the U.S. balance of payments can be helped immeasurably by allowing large quantities of wheat to go abroad to Russia and Eastern Europe.

Such sales of wheat will benefit U.S. farmers. The price received for such wheat may not be affected much because the subsidized price of wheat is already higher than the world level. But greater use of U.S. wheat may result in greater volume.

U.S. wheatgrowers, by Federal law, are permitted to grow wheat on less than half their potential acreage. Expanding the market through sales to the Communists may mean greater planted acreage.

One thing President Johnson has injected into the matter—unnecessarily, we believe—is the mention of repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act as a condition for lifting the shipping ban.

We think the President has broad support for allowing greater shipments to Russia. It is, after all, a cash proposition. Polls have shown the American people favor such sales.

So why tie in 14(b)? The 14(b) repeal, which would wipe out so-called right-to-work statutes in nearly 20 States, ought to be considered on its merits. We think there is strong opposition to it. Let it then be given full debate. There is no need to make it appear that a vital swap is involved when, in truth, the President is only paying off a political debt to his labor supporters.

Mr. DOMINICK. I now wish to turn to articles from other areas.

Here is an article from the Pueblo Chieftain dated September 14, 1965, called "Freedom of Conscience?"

FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE?

The Senate Labor Subcommittee, headed by Senator MORSE, of Oregon, has endorsed

repeal of section 14(b) and additionally proposed an amendment which would, in effect, make the National Labor Relations Board and labor officials the overseers of some worker's religious beliefs, while pretending to guarantee "freedom of conscience."

To be exempt from joining and paying dues to a labor union, under the amendment, a workingman would have to: (1) Obtain "a certificate by the National Labor Relations Board * * * (that he) * * * holds conscientious objections to membership in any labor organization based upon his religious training and beliefs" and, (2) have "timely paid, in lieu of periodic dues and initiation fees, sums equal to such dues and initiation fees to a nonreligious charitable fund exempt from taxation. * * * designated by the labor organization."

This amendment would make the National Labor Relations Board the high priests of a workingman's exemption from joining a union, while the union leaders would be the high priests of his redemption for refusing to do so. The very fact that a Senator would propose or endorse such an amendment, even under the pretext of guaranteeing religious freedom, is evidence that he realizes the repeal of section 14(b) would deprive the workingman of freedom in the first place.

The editorial support that we have witnessed in various places around the State is of extraordinary significance to me. It is significant to me that newspaper editorials have been so nearly unanimous in saying that we should do something about these amendments if something is to be done about section 14(b). But they do not believe section 14(b) should be changed.

I believe there are more editorials. Here is one from the Colorado Springs Gazette-Telegraph, dated January 3, 1966, entitled "Union Seeks Voluntary Unionism."

The American Brotherhood of Electrical Workers is to be commended for its stand on voluntary unionism.

This new group of electricians is asking President Johnson to reverse his stand on repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to have so-called right-to-work legislation.

More than 500 members of the union have signed the appeal, which said:

"We as union members, believing in strong unions and the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, support voluntary unionism and the right of every State to decide for itself whether it shall permit compulsory unionism."

This is a step in the right direction. Perhaps now the realization will come that the Government, at any level, has no business interfering in any way with worker and employer relations. States do not have rights; only individuals do.

Chester E. Jensen, business agent, said the ABEW recognize unions should exist for the welfare of the union members rather than for the union officials, and that voluntary unionism forces union officers and agents to consider and work for those things that the members feel are in their best interests.

He added that "there is a need for greater and more sincere cooperation between labor and management. One cannot prosper without the other, and we feel that with the absence of blackjack methods, greater gains can be made for the workers without at the same time injuring the economy as a whole."

This new union which is not affiliated with the AFL-CIO certainly is to be commended for standing up for the principle of voluntary membership.

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1947

I hope the President will not let his personal feeling that the joint resolution passed in 1964 should prevail over the best statesmanlike judgment—that the thing to do now is to let Congress debate and vote on this issue.

It is perfectly right that the joint resolution of August 7, 1964, covers technically the authority which the President is exercising; but as a lawyer, I know there are cases in which the intent with which a particular authority was given may have changed by virtue of circumstances and thereby requires a change in the authority. The intent with which the authority of August 1964 was given, as a reaction to the Gulf of Tonkin attack, is not the intent which is being carried out by the President now in view of the new responsibilities of U.S. forces in Vietnam now.

The one thing about Vietnam that is clear is that this is a new ball game. Again, this analysis by Mr. Lippmann, representing a position which feels less strongly than I do about supporting the President's policy in this situation, supports my contention that the administration is making a serious mistake in resisting what seems to be a broad feeling in Congress that this issue ought to be looked into by the committees, debated by Congress, and voted on. What is often overlooked is the fact that the sporadic debate in this Chamber and on the floor of the House will not lead to a vote on the issue, a vote which is needed.

The distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I have introduced a joint resolution of an affirmative nature which could be the subject of such a vote. The Committee on Foreign Relations undoubtedly will do other things with the joint resolution. But the present policy, it seems to me, is the one error that is being made by the administration concerning Vietnam. I strongly urge the President to correct that mistake before there occurs a basic fissure within the country, which could develop in view of the fact that although the consensus of Americans is to support the President, the majority have a deep disquiet in their hearts about what they are supporting.

Finally, I urge the President not to try to resist the rising tide, but rather to accord with it, as it is in his best interest to do so. He will come out stronger and better fortified, and the country will become more united in this way.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New York in yielding. I have been concerned over the same things about which he is concerned. I have been concerned over the lack of a constructive debate in the Senate on the Vietnamese issue. I have been concerned about the possible abrogation of power by Congress, and I am concerned about the question of whether we are engaging in a war in South Vietnam even though it is sometimes referred to by other words. We all know it is war.

I have been concerned about what the word "win" means, a word which has been used regularly in various types of articles. I have been concerned because the President and his administration have not spelled out our objectives in Vietnam. It is imperative that this be done, if we are to learn what we are doing and if we are to be united. A debate such as the Senator from New York is suggesting would be most helpful.

In that connection, I recently had the opportunity to read two articles published in the magazine, the Reporter, dated January 27, 1966. One article is entitled "Back From Vietnam," and was written by Mr. Edmond Taylor. Mr. Taylor points out the looking glass logic that exists among many people in this connection.

The second article is entitled "The Ho Chi Minh Trail and Our Thai Buildup," written by Mr. Denis Warner. Mr. Warner points out the threat to Thailand and the problems that we and South Vietnam face from a possible resurgence of insurrection in Thailand.

These are such interesting articles that I ask unanimous consent to have them printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reporter, Jan. 7, 1966]

BACK FROM VIETNAM

(By Edmond Taylor)

Looking back at the time I spent in Southeast Asia, the remark of a highly qualified veteran of the struggle against Communist expansion keeps coming back to mind. "The basic books for an understanding of the conflict the United States is waging in Vietnam," he told me, "have been written by Lewis Carroll and Kafka." I think an adequate reference shelf should also include some works of history dealing with the fate of nations or governments—France's Fourth Republic, among others—that became involved in halfhearted wars against wholehearted enemies, and possibly a volume or two of Gibbon on the hazards of trying to achieve crutate security by playing one barbarian power against another.

My notebooks covering 2 months' travel and reporting in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand are peppered with direct or indirect quotations from U.S. military and civilian authorities in the area reflecting, sometimes almost in caricature, the through-the-looking-glass mentality that the war in Vietnam seems to develop among certain Americans in the embattled country itself no less than on campuses or in editorial offices at home. The ultimate example, I suppose, is contained in the notes I jotted down immediately after being subjected to a background briefing on the Ho Chi Minh trail by an American expert whom, before I talked to him, I had assumed to have outstanding qualifications for discussing the problem: "Amazing talk briefing followed by free-ranging exchange with A this morning," my notes read. "Writing it up immediately because would begin doubt own memory if I didn't. A's view almost diametrically opposed to consensus of Westmoreland's staff in Saigon; he agrees we can and should do more to harass PAVN [North Vietnamese regular forces] moving along trail through Laos and Cambodia to South Vietnam but thinks would not be to our military interest to block flow completely. Better to fight PAVN's in South Vietnam at end of their communication lines than up north at the country's border, he argues. More PAVN's who arrive in South Vietnam,

the more we can dispose of with least effort and therefore the faster we can convince Hanoi aggression doesn't pay. Sounds almost convincing way A puts it, but if argument sound why harass Ho Chi Minh trail at all? Maybe USOM [U.S. economic assistance organizations] should set up joint project with Hanoi to surface entire trail; that way they could move even more PAVN's south for us to deal with."

It is probably just as well that the rules governing such briefings—and most of the talks that a correspondent has with American or other western officials in southeast Asia—prohibit any close identification of the source, even by function. The absurdities that one hears are seldom a reliable index of the intellectual, caliber, professional competence, or patriotic dedication of the official. Some of the most distressing nonsense I listened to, especially in Saigon and in Vientiane, came from Americans noted among their colleagues around the world for courage, integrity, and tough-mindedness. Not infrequently the speaker does not himself believe what he is saying, but for reasons of policy feels that it is his duty to mislead the press while trying to avoid telling an outright lie. I strongly suspect, for example, that A's singular approach to the problem of the Ho Chi Minh trail, perhaps the key strategic issue of the war in Vietnam, was simply the result of an instruction from some superior authority to try to discourage correspondents from playing it up at that time, the time being the eve of the Johnson peace offensive and of the visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Shelepin to Hanoi.

LOOKING-GLASS LOGIC

The theory—or chimera—that if only we display enough tact the Soviet Union can be converted into a de facto ally of the United States in Asia, sharing the military burden of containing Chinese expansion, especially in southeast Asia, has a strong hold on the minds of a number of U.S. officials in the area, especially among those with a New Frontier background. Naturally, those who believe in the doctrine of the Soviet counterweight dread any intensification or extension of the fighting in Vietnam that might embarrass the Soviet leaders vis-a-vis the Communist world and thus make it more difficult for them to cooperate with us in southeast Asia.

Any stepped-up U.S. military activity in Laos to interdict the Ho Chi Minh trail is particularly and explicitly disapproved of by the people belonging to this school of thought because, as one of them explained to me, the Soviet Union, as a signatory and guarantor of the 1962 Geneva accords for the neutralization of Laos, might take umbrage if we violated them.

So far Moscow has taken no umbrage over the more than 1,500 violations of the accords by North Vietnam as noted by the International Control Commission, and indeed has preferred not to notice the present substantial though decently camouflaged U.S. military activity in Laos. Consequently it is argued by some hard-minded American diplomats in the theater that a sizable increase of U.S. military pressure against the trail, as desired by Gen. William C. Westmoreland, could be effected without major impact on our relations with Moscow, provided we continue to pay lip-service to the fiction of Laotian neutrality. But the we-can-count-on-Russia school seems reluctant to accept any risk, however slight, of offending Soviet susceptibilities at this time. Hence the tendency to fall back on looking-glass logic in assessing the strategic role of the trail. (Ho Chi Minh's own assessment of it is indicated by the 10,000 or more crack PAVN troops, not to mention the 30,000 to 40,000 Pathet Lao guerrillas, permanently stationed on Laotian soil to protect the flow of reinforcements for the Vietcong in South Vietnam from ground

1948

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- SENATE

February 3, 1966

harassment by United States or Royal Lao forces.)

One of the reasons why proponents of close cooperation with Soviet Russia in Asia often sound like Alice—or like a mixture of Alice and Walter Lippmann—is that there is a glaring disparity between the avowed vagueness of their objectives and the sacrifices, in terms of American prestige or even of American lives, they appear willing to make in order to promote them. "Russia is cooperating with us in India to help India resist Chinese expansion," one well-informed spokesman said to me, "but of course we can't expect the Soviets to go as far as that in Hanoi; if they counterbalance Chinese influence there to some degree it is probably a good thing from our viewpoint, even if it involves intensified Soviet military aid to North Vietnam. Surely it would be to our long-term interest if an increased Soviet presence in southeast Asia led to some reduction in both the Chinese and the United States' pretences there."

The thesis that an increased Soviet presence anywhere in Asia is advantageous to U.S. national interests seems highly debatable, especially to someone who, like myself, has had the opportunity to see what the supposed United States-Soviet cooperation in India really implies. There may be a macabre logic in tolerating increased Soviet military assistance to North Vietnam, but it seems stretching reason beyond the breaking point to accept paralyzing restrictions on our conduct of the war in Vietnam simply to enjoy the privilege of seeing Russian rather than Chinese bullets kill American soldiers. Yet to date that is the only tangible benefit anyone can promise from the enhancement of Soviet influence in southeast Asia we seem so anxious to encourage. If it is true, as some say, that Moscow has been nursing Hanoi to adopt a more flexible attitude toward peace negotiations, no one as yet dares to claim he has detected any reliable signs that Hanoi is responsive to Soviet advice. Some of the best qualified U.S. Asian experts doubt seriously that the North Vietnamese leaders could break loose from China and modify their present unconditional-victory policy even if they wanted to.

Occasionally a reporter who listens carefully will pick up from certain diplomatic sources both in the southeast Asian capitals and in New Delhi what appears to be discreet hints of incit Soviet-United States understandings on some subjects dating back to the Kennedy-Khrushchev meetings in Vienna in 1961—understandings that go substantially beyond such public agreements as the test ban treaty banning above-ground nuclear tests or the 1962 Laos accords. It is just barely conceivable, therefore, that the top-secret files of the State Department and the White House contain evidence that if it could be revealed might enable American representatives in Asia to justify the hopes some of them seem to place in cooperation with Moscow as the key to peace in Vietnam—and throughout this vast continent—without sounding like the Mad Hatter. A reporter lacking access to such evidence, if it exists, can only view with dismay what at best appears to be an example of diplomatic professionalism breaking free from the gravitational field of 20th century political reality and orbiting in a universe of pure fancy.

Some Americans one encounters, notably in Saigon, seemingly go out of their way to invent new and totally unnecessary taboos and purely theoretical dilemmas for themselves. One such was the official who, according to my notes, was already worrying last November—somewhat prematurely, it seemed to me—about the possibility of our inflicting such a crushing defeat on Ho Chi Minh that it would sweep away his regime and cause North Vietnam itself to be swal-

lowed up by China, thereby "bringing Chinese power down to the 17th parallel, which clearly would not be to our long-term interests in Asia." Then there was the senior official who has demonstrated his personal courage and patriotism by voluntarily remaining in South Vietnam far longer than the normal call of duty, but who argued vehemently against bombing Hanoi on the grounds that if we adopted such a course the Vietcong would no longer feel inhibited in unleashing all-out terrorism against American installations in Saigon. (Whatever inhibitions the Vietcong may have had, they bombed the Metropole Hotel only a few days later.)

THE PROBLEM OF THE TRAIL

Perhaps it is impossible to win the struggle in Vietnam—or even to avoid a humiliating defeat—unless we abandon the whole concept of limited war and cast off all the self-imposed restrictions on its prosecution, regardless of the consequences. Some of the rare and generally rather subdued hawks favor such a course. Others, by no means dovish in their opposition to Communist expansionism, fear that through reckless escalation of the Vietnam war we might blunder—at a time and place of the enemy's choosing—into a major conflict with China. Moreover, these Americans say, unlimited expansion of the war in Vietnam—or a policy of uninhibited ruthlessness in waging it—is not necessary to achieve our essential objectives there. Some hard decisions may yet have to be taken, they admit, and some carefully calculated risks accepted; all that is needed is for the military to display some initiative and imagination in applying the directives they have already been given and in utilizing the resources now at their command.

Whether it is altogether fair to blame the Military Establishment for what strikes an impartial observer as the undeniably brass-bound conduct of the war is hard to say. It would certainly be unfair to pin the blame personally on General Westmoreland, one of the most hobbled and politically harassed grand captains in the history of warfare, who must shoulder the essential responsibilities of a theater commander without having the traditional authority of one. The problem of the Ho Chi Minh trail illustrates some of the deficiencies of our approach. Westmoreland and his staff are said to be convinced that more effective measures than the bombing attacks we were making regularly before the Johnson aerial truce are needed to choke off the flow of Vietcong reinforcements from North Vietnam (now estimated at more than 2,500 a month). The obvious place to cut the trail (actually a complex of roads, trails, and waterways) is where it runs through Laos, through some U.S. experts in Saigon attach almost as much strategic importance to the Communist bases and supply line in eastern Cambodia.

To seal the route totally and in relative safety by conventional means would imply planting several U.S. divisions in one of the wildest jungles of Asia. The logistic problem of maintaining so considerable a force would itself be tremendous. It is therefore understandable, if not quite excusable, that military spokesmen in Saigon sometimes prefer to lead correspondents on conducted tours through the looking glass by simultaneously boasting to them about the effectiveness of our air attacks on the Ho Chi Minh trail (which actually seem to have had very little effect) and wringing their hands over the steady increase in military traffic along the trail since the attacks began.

Yet there are various less conventional solutions to the problem of the trail which, though neither completely effective nor wholly without risk, might be worth considering: hit and run commando raids on depots and staging areas, intermittent harass-

ment from secure jungle bases, and air cavalry sweeps, to mention a few. By the imaginative use of the fantastic detection devices of various sorts available to our Armed Forces, which, thanks to the techniques of air-ground cooperation, have been raised to a new pitch of efficiency during the Vietnam war, it is possible today to conceive of long-range operations behind the enemy lines in jungle country whose audacity would have left a Wingate breathless. But audacity implies risk, and the boldest American commander, given the present confused state of American opinion and the irresponsible attitude of part of the American press, would scarcely dare to risk even a U.S. battalion on an operation, however attractive strategically, that with bad luck might turn into what some headline writers would be likely to call an American Dienbienphu.

BATTLING THE CLOCK

Our reluctance so far to move against the privileged Vietcong sanctuary in Cambodia is less excusable, for neither the logistic nor the political difficulties to be overcome are really serious. The recent public announcement here that a so-called free Cambodian maquis was beginning to operate in Cambodia may indicate that at long last the problem is being dealt with. It should be no great problem to discover in South Vietnam a sufficient number of free Cambodian volunteers to clean out the North Vietnamese occupation force that has established itself in eastern Cambodia (whether with or without the explicit permission of Prince Sihanouk is not quite clear). Covertly arranging maritime and fluvial mishaps of various kinds for the ostensibly neutral vessels that have been smuggling arms into both Cambodia and South Vietnam should be even easier. (And while we are at it, it might be useful if the Saigon government would give dispensation to some freedom-loving Montagnard rebels in the remoter fastnesses of North Vietnam who would claim the same recognition at an eventual peace conference that Hanoi demands for the Vietcong rebels in South Vietnam.)

Both our military and political authorities in Vietnam—and to some extent throughout southeast Asia—often give the impression of lacking political realism through failure to take time into account as a key psychological factor in our strategy for the war. U.S. civilian experts talk glibly about the need for the American people to face a generation of conflict in southeast Asia, and the military experts give one the impression that no decisive operations can be launched before the end of the present U.S. troop buildup—assuming that it continues as planned—some time next winter. By then it seems only too likely that the enemy will be more numerous and better armed than he is today, and the American people more war weary than they are now—unless someone in the meantime has been able to offer them a realistic and therefore convincing program for ending the struggle honorably, at an acceptable cost and within a reasonable span.

The one task we cannot shirk in Vietnam is finishing the job we committed ourselves to in the eyes of Asia to complete: that of effectively putting a stop to all North Vietnamese military intervention in South Vietnam's civil war. Any betrayal of this self-imposed mission, however camouflaged by worthless international guarantees, illusory controls, and fallacious free determination, would irretrievably damage our prestige, our honor, and even our national integrity. If we abandon our Vietnamese allies—for they are that, whatever their faults, and they have been faithful in their fashion—while they are the victims of outside aggression, we shall never find any others in Asia, or probably anywhere else.

To avert such a consequence, we should mobilize all the power necessary to crush the

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1949

enemy's resistance and achieve a rapid, clear-cut victory. The longer the present looking-glass war in southeast Asia goes on, the greater the likelihood that it will lead either to a catastrophic and dishonorable peace or to a general conflagration.

[From the Reporter, Jan. 7, 1966]

THE HO CHI MINH TRAIL AND OUR THAI BUILDUP

(By Denis Warner)

BANGKOK.—"Within 8 hours of their arrival here by air we could have the troops on the road with everything they need in the way of equipment." The briefing officer from the 7th U.S. Maintenance Battalion spoke with pride as he showed me around the supply depot in Korat, Thailand. With a minimum of publicity and what appears to be maximum efficiency, this little-known, and depressed economic and political center of the 15 backward northeastern Thai provinces has become a military base with impressive offensive and defensive potentials.

The tanks, the amphibious carriers, the trucks, and jeeps are loaded and ready to go. The guns are hitched to their carriages. Under a huge tent inflated by compressed air I counted more than a hundred Jeeps. They occupied only a small part of the 176,000 square feet of covered space available. There are another 144,000 square feet of semipermanent installations providing controlled-humidity storage space. There are miles of water and oil pipelines, and immense stacks of barbed wire. Complete bridge units are loaded on trucks. There are railway ties and rails, ammunition, guns—the lot.

The amount of supplies is secret, but there is enough to keep the 7th Maintenance Battalion busy full time. "You can say that we have more than 41,000 tons of equipment valued at \$50 million if you like," the briefing officer told me. "Or you might say that we have more than enough for a battalion and less than enough for a division." An educated guess suggests that the higher estimate may well be conservative, but in any event the materiel now available is primarily of symbolic importance. Impressive as the buildup is, it is overshadowed by the emergency program now underway that within a few months will multiply Korat's military potential and, if need be, permit expansion of the already established control unit, the 9th U.S. Logistical Command "B," to its full capacity of between 35,000 and 66,000 support troops and a field force of 100,000 combat troops.

As a base, Korat still suffers from many handicaps. Improved rail communications and the construction of the Friendship Highway in 1958 halved the travel time to and from Bangkok. But Bangkok is itself a bottleneck. Four-fifths of Thailand's expanding foreign trade passes through its inadequate port facilities, and it cannot cope with the operational needs of a "B"-category U.S. logistical command.

To meet the situation, the United States is building a new military airfield, port, and over-the-beaches landing zone at Ban Sattahip, about a hundred miles south-southeast of Bangkok. Existing roads and rail lines between Ban Sattahip and Korat are being improved and the 538th Engineer Battalion is completing a 163-mile direct all-weather route between the two bases through the rugged limestone hills that skirt the southern rim of the Korat plateau. The road is scheduled to be fully operational in March. "If you think Camranh Bay is impressive, go to Sattahip about the middle of the year and see what is doing there," one American officer told me. "There has never been another military pipeline quite like this."

Along with these urgent road-construction projects, which by unofficial estimate will cost more than \$100 million this year, the 379th U.S. Signal Battalion, with headquarters in Korat, is erecting communications equipment to link northeast Thailand with Vientiane, Bangkok, and Saigon. Permanent long-range installations have already been built at Korat and Ubon, a U.S. Air Force fighter-bomber and Australian fighter base. Elsewhere, scatter-radio sets that provide 24 channels and 16 teletype circuits are being replaced by improved heavy-duty units, able to operate over as many as 60 channels and at a much greater range.

Though none of this information is regarded as sensitive, United States and Thai authorities are much more touchy on the question of the development and use of airfields in the northeast. As everyone in the area is well aware, however, airfield development has not lagged; the bomb-laden planes constantly taking off from Korat and Ubon for Laos and Vietnam are not engaged in routine training missions. The runway at Korat is more than 2 miles long, and even bigger ones are planned for the new airfield at Ban Sattahip. All three will be able to handle the largest U.S. bombers and transport planes.

A HANDFUL OF DISSIDENTS

Thanks to the Rusk-Thanat agreement of 1962 on U.S. bilateral (as well as collective) responsibilities under SEATO, and to Washington's demonstrable determination to honor its pledges in southeast Asia, Thailand has become a highly cooperative ally. It is also a threatened one. Though Marshal Chen Yi's promise that 1965 would see the outbreak of revolutionary war in the country went unfulfilled, there is no doubt that the creation of an insurgency situation in the northeast is a matter of priority for Hanoi and Peiping. A Thai Government report on November 26 that 24 police agents had been murdered in an upsurge of Communist terrorism was followed on December 15 by the announcement in Peiping of the merger of the Thailand Independence Movement and the Thailand Patriotic Front, both Peiping creations and both pledged to the "patriotic struggle" against the Thai Government and the United States.

It has been 12 months since Peiping first announced the existence of the front and the movement, and so far neither appears to have made significant progress. Their leadership is confined to a handful of Thai left-wing dissidents living in Peiping. Two of the best known are Mongkon Nanakorn, who was imprisoned in Thailand for Communist activities in 1953 and released 2 years later, and Phayom Chulanont, a former member of Parliament, who left the country in 1963. Phayom went as the "Thai delegate" to the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Conference in Ghana last May, and Mongkon led a "Thai trade-union delegation" to the International Trade Union Solidarity Conference at Hanoi in June. But speculation continues in Bangkok that the merger may mean that Peiping has given orders for an advance in Communist timetables in the northeast, and especially in the heavily infiltrated provinces of Nakhon Phanom, which is conveniently close to Communist Pathet Lao centers of activity around Thakhek across the Mekong in Laos.

Still, the size and form of the American buildup at Korat suggests that it is not only intended for use against the sort of insurgency situation that might conceivably develop. To fight such a war of national liberation successfully, Thailand must cope with the problems of administration, police intelligence, and, in the longer haul, social and economic programs. It is difficult to see how the commitment of American mil-

tary power on the scale of the Ban Sattahip-Korat preparations would be appropriate or even useful for those purposes.

Any meaningful U.S. contingency planning would, of course, have to take into account the possibility, however remote, of a Chinese or Vietminh diversionary attack against Thailand. As a base for meeting such an attack, Korat has many disadvantages. Though the town itself is often called the gateway to the northeast, it is both remote and geographically isolated from the north, the one part of Thailand in which Chinese action might be expected or is even possible. For several years Chinese roadbuilders have been active in Yunnan Province and beyond. Chinese military engineers built a road from Yunnan into the Laotian province of Phong Saly, where Gen. Khammouane Bhoupa, the local military commander, has long acted independently of both the Pathet Lao and Royal Lao elements and in close collaboration with the Chinese. Another Chinese road runs from Yunnan to Nam Tha. As the rightist Gen. Phoumi Nosavan discovered in 1962, the road from Nam Tha to Ban Houei Sai on the Mekong River border is quite suitable for the rapid movement of troops. But to counter such a threat on the ground, Korat is located in the wrong place, both tactically and on the basis of existing lines of communication.

It is much better sited as a shield for defensive operations against a Pathet Lao-Vietminh incursion through the northeast. Of all contingencies, however, this is least likely. A second front in northeastern Thailand would be useful to the Vietminh, but not if it involved a diversion of their own resources and brought Thailand directly into the war. Even so, the big U.S. buildup at Korat represents an important psychological reassurance to the Thais. Over the longer term it could also serve as a major supply base for U.S. forces in southeast Asia, ready to back up the function of Camranh in an emergency.

ROAD MAP TO VICTORY

It is difficult to escape the thought that the Korat base and its enormously costly link to Ban Sattahip could also provide a potential jumpingoff point to counter Vietminh use of the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos. This possibility has certainly not escaped the attention of Russian, North Vietnamese, and other diplomats in Vientiane.

Air action against North Vietnam and the Ho Chi Minh Trail during the past 12 months has had the contradictory effect of both exacerbating the problems facing the Vietminh cadres and main-force units moving south and at the same time stimulating this flow. Now, more than ever before, the trail is a significant factor in the war. The movement of supplies along its maze of bridle paths, tracks, and roads is probably small enough to be relatively unimportant, but the volume of manpower (even if Saigon's estimates of the increased dry-season flow are exaggerated) is such that it threatens to nullify the best of efforts in South Vietnam.

The increasing U.S. air capability in Thailand and Vietnam and the recent use of Guam-based B-52's points to heavier bombing of the trail. Yet experience here and in Korea suggests that interdiction from the air is simply not possible. The ingrained Vietcong fear of defoliation by chemical spray could conceivably be exploited to add to the fears and the perils of the route, but at best this would be no more than a harassment. Small-scale commando actions would have the same effect, and would inevitably prove costly. The regions through which the trail passes in Laos are sparsely populated, but, to the Vietcong's enormous advantage, the local tribesmen's loyalty to them is complete, especially in the wilderness of southeastern Laos.

1950

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 3, 1966

Despite seemingly effective landslide bombing missions, the Vietcong have continued to use two main entry routes into Laos from North Vietnam, the Mu Gia and Nape Passes. Two roads, including one newly built, run south to the main staging post of Tchepcne on Route 9. A third access route crosses the demilitarized zone in the Vietcong-dominated northwestern region of South Vietnam and picks up Route 9.

Route 9 is critical. Deny it to the Vietcong and the trail is out. But this is neither tactically nor logically feasible in an operation mounted exclusively in South Vietnam. The 1st ARVN Division in Quang Tri Province, at the eastern end of Route 9, is experienced and effective. While its successes in recent months have been outstanding, it cannot by itself consolidate its gains in the immensely difficult terrain where Route 9 crosses the Laotian border. To perform this limited task, which would at most deny the Vietcong only one of the three main lines of communication from North Vietnam into Laos, would not only require substantial reinforcement but would tax the logistical capabilities of the American and Vietnamese forces at Hué and Danang. But to attempt a more substantial operation from bases on the coast would be next to impossible.

A more obvious threat to the Ho Chi Minh Trail could be directed through Pakse and Savannakhet in western Laos, where the going is much easier. Provided that northeastern Thailand does not erupt into full-scale insurgency, the lines of communication would be secure. Moreover, the new supply route from Ban Sattahip through Korat would relieve South Vietnam of the major logistical strain of an operation that could eventually require three or more divisions.

It may be argued that such an operation would destroy all that remains of the 1962 Geneva Agreement on Laos. The political issues involved the reaction of both Vientiane and the Soviet Union and could present problems. It has, however, long been apparent that North Vietnam signed that agreement only to safeguard its own unlawful and vital corridor to South Vietnam. So far, the preservation of the fiction of Laotian neutrality and noninvolvement has been useful in maintaining relative tranquillity in Vientiane. But to those in the field who favor such an operation, this consideration is hardly a match for the issues at stake in Vietnam and the frustration of the American effort threatened by the continued and expanding use of the Ho Chi Minh Trail. To these men, the questions that matter are whether there is demonstrable evidence that the North Vietnamese have abrogated the Geneva Agreement by their use of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, whether the reinforcements using the trail are of major significance in the Vietcong war effort, and finally, whether ground action against the trail would prove effective.

There can be no doubt about the answer to the first two questions. As for the third, many responsible military men believe that the difficulties to be overcome would be rewarded by the results. It is, therefore, not inconceivable that Korat, already a psychological threat to the Vietminh, may eventually be invested with a major role in future U.S. offensive plans in South Vietnam.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, after we have had an opportunity to review these articles, I think a debate on the resolution of the Senator would be very helpful.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator for his intercession and for the very interesting articles from the Reporter magazine which I know will be helpful to our review.

Mr. President, it requires time and attrition sometimes to have light break

through to the real point. The point that I am pressing upon the President of the United States is—and this is the light that I hope will break through to his consciousness—the fact that this will help and not hurt. It is not in derogation of the authority that he has been exercising. It is no reflection on his authority to conduct foreign affairs.

The President himself demonstrated that he wanted and needed to have the partnership of Congress by asking for the resolution of August, 1964. Now that there is a new ball game, why does he not ask again and get the same fortification, the same strength, and the same substantiality so that he cannot be challenged on the ground of illegality, as has been done, or challenged on the ground that he is using authority for a purpose which was never intended, for a new purpose, for a new escalation of the struggle.

I believe that everything is to be gained and nothing is to be lost, beyond what has been already lost by furnishing food for the propaganda mills in Hanoi.

The strength that can be afforded to our freedom and its decision far outweighs any minor disadvantage of any character.

As one who has supported the President, I hope that before it is too late, in terms of graver disquiet than presently exists, we can have a congressional debate.

I can understand why the congressional committees, representing the majority, have been unwilling to have this debate so far unless the President should ask for it. Would it not be better for the President to ask for this resolution, as he did in August of 1964, than to be forced to it? The committees would take the ball and run with it. That is what can result in view of the gathering storm in Congress, not because of the war in Vietnam, but because of the apparent feeling of the President that Congress should not have an opportunity to debate and vote on the issue.

I urge the President to seek the benefit of this debate.

Mr. President, to intellectual men—and the President is an intelligent man—the proudest words in the English language are: "I am persuaded."

I hope very much that the President may invite debate in this matter in view of the feelings of so many who thoroughly support him in terms of what he is trying to do and in terms of the freedom and safety of our Nation and of the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, while I have not heard everything that the Senator has said, I believe that he is proposing a discussion on the floor of the Senate in regard to the Vietnamese situation.

Mr. JAVITS. I say that the President should come to us again, as he did in August 1964, for a resolution on Vietnam. I say that as a supporter of the President.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee, I point out that

the authorization and appropriation bills must come before us within the next 2 or 3 weeks.

It would seem to me that there would be a very full discussion not only of the subject matter of the bills, but also of the entire problem that faces the President and ourselves.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator knows that there is no one whom I respect more than I do the senior Senator from Massachusetts. Yet, I do not believe that the discussion and debate which will be engendered, as it will be, by the authorization and appropriation bills, will be quite opposite to what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and other Senators, myself included, are talking about.

The authorization and appropriation bills represent a different issue. The issue would be whether we were going to support the men in the field.

This is not something that I imagine. We had this issue in connection with the appropriation last year of the \$700 million.

The entire debate was stultified by the fact that no one would ever desire to stop the appropriation of money for men who are fighting. We have been there ourselves. Many of us have been in the armed services.

The only thing that is germane is that the policy is up for determination in a sense resolution.

The President has done it before, in my judgment, a little arbitrarily. Speaking as one who supports the President in his policy, I am asking him to do it again when the situation is so changed and when there is a gathering storm of feeling that it should be done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator from New York and the Senator from Massachusetts are very far apart in their points of view.

My point is simply that in our hearings, which extended over a period of 3 days, there was testimony from the Secretary of Defense and from General Wheeler and others. The entire problem was discussed.

I agree that there was no discussion as to whether a new resolution was needed. However, the entire general principle as to why we were there and what we were doing was discussed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMISSION ON AUTOMATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to the report of the Special Commission on Automation. This report has just been handed to the President. As one of the authors of the legislation which created the Commission, I have great interest in the results of the Commission's work.

Automation is a very critical problem for the United States. It affects the work of the committee on which I am a ranking minority member, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It is recommended in the report of the Commission that \$2 billion be pro-

1922

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 3, 1966

is in fact the defense of a vital interest of the United States.

Nations do not fight indefinitely if they are not convinced that their own vital interests are at stake. Although the Korean war began under much better legal and moral auspices than did our entanglement in Vietnam, the American people came to hate the Korean war. The reason for that was that they did not believe that the interests of America in Korea on the Asian mainland were great enough to justify the casualties that were being suffered.

The other principal difficulty in uniting the country behind a national purpose in Indochina is that the President's diplomatic advisers have never defined our national purpose except in the vaguest, most ambiguous generalities about aggression and freedom. The country could be united—in the preponderant mass—on a policy which rested on a limited strategy and on limited political objectives. It cannot be united on a policy of trading American lives for Asian lives on the mainland of Asia in order to make General Ky or his successor the ruler of all of South Vietnam. The division of the country will simply grow worse as the casualties and the costs increase and the attainment of our aims and the end of the fighting continue to elude us.

The revision of our policy in Vietnam—the revision of our strategy and our political purposes and plans—is the indispensable condition of a really united country and of an eventual truce abroad. Gestures, propaganda, public relations, and bombing and more bombing will not work. Without a revision of the policy—or of our war aims as stated by Secretary Rusk of our military strategy as approved by Secretary McNamara—the President will find that he is in a dead end street.

WARREN M. BLOOMBERG, MAN OF THE YEAR

MR. BREWSTER. Mr. President, organizations throughout the 50 States have named outstanding men for their deeds and dedication during the year 1965, as "Man of the Year."

Assistant Postmaster Warren M. Bloomberg, of Baltimore, received such an award from the Maryland Society of Training Directors at their first annual awards dinner last week. Mr. Bloomberg has not only labored tirelessly to get the mail through, but has also logged many hours to improve labor-management relations in the post office system. His initiation of the impact training program has added a human relations attitude to labor-management discussions.

Mr. Warren M. Bloomberg, a respected Marylander, a responsible public servant, and a resourceful leader is truly a "Man of the Year."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Baltimore News-American be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL ASSISTANT "MAN OF YEAR"

(By Janelee Koide)

Baltimore Assistant Postmaster Warren M. Bloomberg was named "Man of the Year" at the Maryland Society of Training Directors' first annual awards night last evening at the Stafford Hotel.

Bloomberg was chosen for the award because he most exemplified "outstanding leadership and support of training while not being primarily engaged in the training field," explained MSTD President Lou Clemens before the meeting.

He added that Bloomberg's initiation of the post office's impact training program was the factor most responsible for the assistant postmaster being selected for the honor.

"The impact program," Clemens explained, "is intended to inject a human relations attitude into labor-management discussions and is a landmark in labor-management dealings within the post office system."

Other training awards presented last night went to Dwight P. Jacobs, supervisor of education service to industry, State Department of Education, and to Clyde S. Hartlove, vice president of public relations and employee development, Esskay Quality Meat Co.

Clemens noted that although the MSTD's three-man awards committee was composed of members of industry, two of the three awards were presented to Government employees—one Federal and one State.

If a certain element of pride can be detected there, it's probably pardonable, Clemens himself is a Government man, assistant training officer at the post office here.

Awards committee members were John Ennis, of Proctor & Gamble Co.; Gustave Semesky, FMC Corp.; and Mrs. Mildred Baxter of the C. & P. Telephone Co.

Sixty percent of the persons in the Maryland Society of Training Directors represent industry, Clemens said, while 20 percent come from service industries. The remaining 20 percent represent various levels of government.

The post office here will accept applications for garageman, PFS L-3, \$2.37 an hour, until February 28.

Residents of Baltimore City, Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Hartford, and Howard Counties are eligible to apply.

Because existing registers for the job will be superseded by results of the new examination, all persons with eligibility on present registers should reapply.

Full information and application forms may be obtained from the Post Office Board, U.S. Civil Service Examiners, Room 601, McCawley Building, 37 Commerce Street, Baltimore 21202 or from first-, second-, and third-class post offices in the counties affected.

THE CHURCHES AND VIETNAM

MR. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful articles that has come to my attention on the Vietnam issue is one written by Dr. Georgia Harkness, entitled "The Churches and Vietnam," which was published in the January 26, 1966, issue of the Christian Century.

Dr. Harkness is one of the Nation's most respected theologians. For many years she has inspired seminary students with her lectures and her probing mind. I had the privilege of studying with her briefly in 1946. At the present time, she is professor emeritus of applied theology at the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, Calif.

I ask unanimous consent to have her article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHURCHES AND VIETNAM—NO MATTER HOW AMBIGUOUS ARE THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE CONFLICT, THE CHRISTIAN GOSPEL MAKES CERTAIN ATTITUDES TOWARD THEM CLEAR

(By Georgia Harkness)

In the face of the escalating war in Vietnam the churches have been conspicuously failing to direct the thinking of their members on the portentous issues involved. At its meeting in December the National Council

of Churches' General Board adopted an admirable policy statement and message, but so far as local congregations are concerned a question uppermost in the minds and hearts of millions of Americans is being bypassed in American Protestantism.

There is no denying the complexity of the situation, a complexity that leaves one uncertain what to say unless he accepts or rejects outright the administration's position. Yet our first obligation as Christians is clear: to maintain our ethical sensitivity to the demands of the Gospel. Obviously, the Gospel gives us no blueprint for the precise forms of action to be taken amid the complexities of the modern world; that is why Christian pacifists and nonpacifists can sincerely differ. Yet we have firm common ground on which to stand in the Gospel's imperatives on love and reconciliation, on respect for human life, and the need to relieve suffering wherever it is found, on the recognition that every person, whatever his race, nation, social status, or political coloration, is of infinite worth to God and should be viewed as bound to us by ties of brotherhood. These imperatives have been affirmed again and again by great representative bodies of churchmen. Whether we are pacifists or nonpacifists, supporters of the administration's foreign policy or dissenters, we ought to take them seriously.

UNWARRANTED INSENSITIVITY

Yet what is happening to our inner attitudes? The Vietcong are human beings, made in God's image like ourselves, perhaps less culturally advanced but as precious in God's sight as any American. When we hear a news report of 240 American boys killed in 1 week, we rightly wince. When we hear in the same report of 2,400 Vietcong killed, are we not inclined to rejoice as if something good had happened? Do we think God rejoices?

In sensitivity to the taking of human life when it is on the other side creeps up on us in every war. We rationalize by saying that thus the end of the war is brought nearer. Perhaps, and perhaps not. In the present conflict the escalation of the war seems to have stiffened Hanoi's opposition to negotiation, as is likely to be the case in any conflict when resources with which to go on fighting remain. Be that as it may, for the Christian to view with composure and even with rejoicing the large-scale death of other human beings is an indication that somewhere along the way our Christian sensitivity has slipped.

Another angle of insensitivity appears in the dulling of our reaction to the slaughter of innocent noncombatants—old men and women, mothers and their babies, terrified villagers who may have been warned but who have no place to go when the napalm begins to fall. It is to the credit of our soldiers that many of them, though trained in the stern realities of war, shrink from such slaughter. If we have let our sensibilities be lulled to sleep, a look at such photographs as those of "the blunt reality of war in Vietnam" in Life's November 26, 1965, issue should help to awaken us.

Though new in form, this is the old question of the legitimacy of obliteration bombing. Those whose memories reach back to World War II may recall that the protest against the wholesale bombing of civilian populations issued by a small group of religious leaders—there were only 23 of us—was generally greeted with opposition and derision. But after the war was over the report of the commission appointed by the Federal Council of Churches on "The Relation of the Church to the War in the Light of the Christian Faith" (often called the Calhoun Commission) almost unanimously condemned the practice of obliteration bombing. What the judgment of history will be on the conduct of the war in Vietnam remains an open question.

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1923

A closely related issue for which the churches must be concerned if they are to remain Christian is the need for a vastly accelerated program of relief. The efforts of our Government to care for refugees and wounded villagers are commendable. Yet a view of the enormity of the problem and the continuing destruction they are inadequate. The longer the war continues the greater the need will become. Here is clearly something the churches can support—a service to which the Christian conscience can respond.

More than 600,000 persons in South Vietnam have fled from their homes to escape the violence from both sides. And in the north there are unknown numbers of victims of our bombing, for while an attempt has been made to limit that bombing to military and other strategic targets, persons are inevitably caught in the destruction. To minister to the suffering, whether in the south or north, both Church World Service and the American Friends Service Committee are appealing for funds to carry on a greatly increased program of relief. Though many of us feel helpless in this crisis, helping relieve desperate human need is certainly one thing we can do.

Let us look ahead a little. We should welcome our Government's offer to give economic aid to Vietnam and other countries of southeast Asia. Will we be as willing when the war finally terminates with all Vietnam such a shambles that nothing but a long and very expensive program will rebuild it? National honor will hardly let us leave the area in that condition, yet one can anticipate the outrages at the expense involved, at its impingement on the cost of domestic programs. Christians must then insist that if we can pour out vast sums of money as well as human life to win the war in Vietnam, we must be as willing to expend our tax funds to create conditions for decent human living in the shattered area.

THE RIGHT AND DUTY TO PROTEST

I must speak now of a more disputed issue. What about the demonstrations, marches, and other forms of protest against Government policy? Shall we defend them, or shall we oppose them as unpatriotic and as a means of giving aid and comfort to the enemy while other young Americans suffer and die for us in Vietnam? There is clearly no justification for dishonesty or for draft dodging. The burning of a draft card is both a defiant and a futile form of protest. And though we may sympathize with the deep concern that has prompted self-immolation, we must agree that suicide is not the Christian answer.

When conducted in an orderly manner demonstrations are within the American tradition of the right to free expression of opinion. To forbid them is to stifle democracy at home under the guise of preserving it abroad. Certainly they should be permitted when the safety and welfare of the public are not infringed upon. Yet in most cases, certainly in the much publicized Berkeley demonstrations, it is a very diverse group that marches. There are probably some Communists; there are committed pacifists; there are many who for various reasons do not approve the Government's policy in Vietnam. Some of these reasons are carefully thought out and held with deep conviction; others appear to be less laudably grounded. It is impossible to form one common judgment about all who participate.

At present it is only those clergymen and pacifists who ask for exemption on religious grounds who are legally excused from military service. Of late the question has arisen as to whether this provision should be extended to cover those who conscientiously believe that all war—or one particular war—is unjust. Again, some past history may help to answer the question.

At the Oxford Conference on Life and Work in 1937 there was a clear condemnation of war as "a particular demonstration of the power of sin in this world and a defiance of the righteousness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and him crucified." Yet three positions were stated as conscientiously held by Christians: absolute pacifism, the support of "just wars," and response to the call of the state unless one is absolutely certain that his country is fighting for a wrong cause (report, sec. V, 7). By the time of the Amsterdam Conference of 1948 the atomic age had intervened and the position had shifted somewhat to another triad: denial that modern war can be an act of justice, the duty of citizens to defend the law by force if necessary, and the Christian pacifist position (report, sec. IV, 1). In later assemblies of the World Council of Churches the matter was approached from other angles with less specific statements.

In view of such affirmations by representatives of the world Christian community it would seem that there ought to be standing ground both in the law and in the attitudes of the local community for the person who protests against participation in a war which he conscientiously believes to be unjust. Such a provision if enacted into law would doubtless impose problems for draft boards, but perhaps not more than in the case of Christian pacifists. Judgments would need to be made on the basis of the individual's wider spectrum of life and thought; ministers might be called on to defend deserving persons and refuse support to others. Yet I do not see on what other basis genuine freedom of conscience can be preserved.

A further service the churches can render is to educate their members, as objectively as possible, on the background of the present war. The best brief statement in response to this obligation that I have seen was that in the Church Woman for November 1965. It is true, of course, that there are ambiguous elements in the background which, because they are ambiguous, can be cited on either side of the issue. For example, are all of the Vietcong Communists, as is commonly assumed? The original Vietminh, which became the Vietcong, was anti-French rather than pro-Communist. Most of those now fighting against the South Vietnam Government are peasant lads innocent of ideology, yet there seems little doubt that their leaders are Communist-trained, responsive to the bidding of Hanoi.

Are we in Vietnam to honor the commitments of three Presidents? There is no doubt about the Johnson commitment, but the original Eisenhower offer of aid was conditional upon needed reforms and the establishment of a strong government responsive to the people. (President Eisenhower's letter of Oct. 23, 1954, to Ngo Dinh Diem, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27, 1965, merits perusal (vol. III, No. 136).)

Is our presence in Vietnam a violation of the Geneva accords of 1954? By these agreements the Communists were to withdraw to the north and the French and non-Communists to the south; both sides were to end hostilities and neither zone was to be used as a base for military activities; elections were to be held within 2 years under an international control commission to determine the nation's political future. It is clear that North Vietnam has violated this agreement. It is less well understood that the Geneva accords were mainly between the French and the Vietminh and that both the non-Communist Vietnamese representatives at the conference and the United States refused to sign them.

Such items do not per se settle the rightness or wrongness of the present conflict. They do indicate that we ought to know the facts, including such nuances as these, and state them with as much light and as little heat as possible.

ONE VIEW OF THE WAY AHEAD

I certainly claim no superior wisdom as to what should now be done, but the reader is entitled to know my position. I do not advocate immediate withdrawal, but neither do I think we should continue the present bombing and jungle warfare. The most sensible solution I have seen is that advanced by Senator GEORGE McGOVERN in an address to the Senate which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD previously mentioned. The gist of his suggestions is that we should continue to hold the cities and coast, which can be done without great destruction of life or property, stop the bombing and sit it out until an honorable peace can be negotiated.

In the meantime effort should be made through the United Nations or other agencies to bring about a ceasefire. Negotiations which our Government has proposed, however unconditional, are not likely to come about so long as bombing of North Vietnam continues—hence the hope inspired by the cessation at the beginning of the new year. The United States has sufficiently demonstrated that it is not a "paper tiger" and need not fear loss of prestige should the cessation continue. Negotiations when entered into should certainly include participation by representatives of the National Liberation Front in Vietnam. Eventually there should be a phased withdrawal of all foreign troops except a United Nations or other international peacekeeping force. And free elections by which the people may determine their own political future should be provided for.

A further requirement, as suggested above, is that until economic self-subsistence and rebuilding are attained there must be both the promise and the actuality of massive economic aid, with the provision of hospitals, orphanages, schools, and varied forms of technical assistance. If we make all this possible we will validate our claim that we are in South Vietnam to protect the people from aggression. At the same time such response to human need will form the best insurance against the spread of communism.

Finally, we should be praying for those who suffer in this deeply troubled land, whether friend or enemy, whether Christian, Buddhist, atheist—men, women, and children with stricken bodies and souls, caught in the grip of forces they did not create and do not understand. That, at least, any Christian can do if he shares somewhat the love of God for every suffering one among his human children.

TRIBUTE TO OREN HARRIS, A FORMER REPRESENTATIVE FROM ARKANSAS, NOW A FEDERAL JUDGE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, few Americans have the opportunity to serve their country in both the legislative and judicial branches of the Government. Few men have the chance to bring to the judiciary a quarter century of lawmaking experience, but such a man is Oren Harris, a close, personal friend of mine and the former Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas. He has been sworn in earlier today at El Dorado, Ark., as Federal Judge for both the eastern and western districts of Arkansas, after having been nominated by President Johnson last year.

Judge Harris resigned his seat in the House of Representatives effective February 2, 1966, after 25 years' service in that body and after 9 years as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Oren Harris was in Congress when I came as the Representative of the Third Congressional District of Arkansas in 1942. His service to Arkansas has been exceptional, his fairness as a committee chairman irreproachable, and his judgment wise and mature. I have a very deep admiration for him and have enjoyed working in the Congress with him these many years. Arkansas will miss his services as a legislator, but his intimate knowledge of the law will serve him in good stead and I am thankful that the new judgeship position in Arkansas has been filled by a man of his caliber.

Mr. President, I join the rest of the Arkansas delegation and his colleagues in the House in paying tribute to one of Arkansas' outstanding Representatives. My best wishes to both Judge Harris and his wife, Ruth, in their new life.

ENROLLMENT IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because I know the basic statistics covering enrollment, teachers and high school graduates in full time public elementary and secondary day schools are of continuing interest to my colleagues and because these are the basic statistics which will

be cited time and again in connection with education legislation in the second session, I feel it appropriate to set them forth at this point in my remarks for the reference of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a news release dated January 16, 1966, from the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, together with the accompanying tables, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,

Washington D.C., January 16, 1966.

Enrollments in public elementary and secondary schools this fall rose to 41.1 million, an increase of 727,000 or 1.8 percent over last year, the U.S. Office of Education announced today.

The 12th annual fall survey, conducted in cooperation with State departments of education, also shows:

Enrollments are continuing to increase more rapidly in secondary schools than in elementary schools. The elementary school enrollment of 26.4 million is up 194,000, or 0.7 percent above a year ago. Secondary school enrollments rose 533,000 to 15.7 million, a gain of 3.5 percent.

The estimated average annual expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance in 1965-66 is \$532. Based on average daily membership—counting students both present and absent—the estimated average annual expenditure is \$503.

The survey also showed:

Approximately 1,716,000 full-time and part-time public schoolteachers, an increase of 68,100, or 4.1 percent over 1964.

The estimated average annual salary of all instructional personnel, including principals, teachers, librarians, and others is \$6,700 in 1965-66. The average annual salary for classroom teachers is \$6,500.

About 81,700 full-time public schoolteachers—4.8 percent of the total—do not meet State certification standards. The proportion of teachers with less than standard certificates has been declining slowly in recent years.

Total expenditures for public schools in the current school year will amount to about \$25.8 billion.

In the 1964-65 school year, 16,400 classrooms were abandoned because of school or school district consolidations, population shifts, destruction of buildings, and other factors. The completion of 65,200 classrooms during the same period brought the number of classrooms currently in use to 1,595,000.

(NOTE TO EDITORS.—Further details, giving current year figures by region and State as well as national totals for a 5-year period are contained in the attached tables.)

TABLE 1. Fall 1965 statistics on local school districts, enrollment, teachers, and high school graduates in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools, by state

Region and State	Number of local basic administrative units (school districts) (1)	Number of pupils enrolled			Number of full-time and part-time classroom teachers			Number of full-time classroom teachers with less than standard certificates ¹			High school graduates, 1964-65 (11)
		Total (2)	Elementary ² (3)	Secondary ² (4)	Total (5)	Elementary ² (6)	Secondary ² (7)	Total (8)	Elementary ² (9)	Secondary ² (10)	
United States	8,26,982	42,143,504	26,415,834	15,727,670	1,716,285	967,635	748,650	81,748	51,632	30,116	2,362,100
North Atlantic	4,006	9,867,110	5,863,535	4,003,575	430,754	229,323	201,431	31,862	17,993	13,869	584,666
Connecticut	178	574,798	367,801	206,997	24,970	14,575	10,395	1,600	900	700	31,729
Delaware	59	108,357	62,182	46,177	4,402	2,434	2,368	241	159	82	5,987
Maine	397	223,506	145,631	73,877	9,133	5,717	3,416	314	197	117	12,661
Maryland	24	762,647	442,025	320,622	41,094	16,342	14,752	7,070	4,814	2,256	41,405
Massachusetts	392	1,020,500	616,000	404,500	45,004	24,550	20,454	1,472	708	764	63,364
New Hampshire	199	125,857	83,007	45,850	5,529	3,239	2,290	244	147	97	7,775
New Jersey	604	1,286,000	847,000	439,000	59,000	35,000	24,000	7,300	5,600	1,700	78,000
New York	997	3,190,845	1,835,184	1,357,661	146,083	74,885	71,198	9,684	3,473	6,211	182,237
Pennsylvania	863	2,189,829	1,236,421	963,408	89,009	44,716	45,293	802	208	534	143,200
Rhode Island	40	156,501	88,980	65,521	6,630	3,374	3,256	421	256	165	9,157
Vermont	262	84,254	55,639	28,615	3,883	2,278	1,605	189	71	118	4,462
District of Columbia	1	144,016	92,665	51,351	5,617	3,213	2,404	2,525	1,400	1,125	4,709
Great Lakes and Plains	14,744	11,854,748	7,506,854	4,347,894	492,418	278,986	213,432	18,734	13,061	5,673	688,535
Illinois	1,354	2,067,689	1,366,223	721,466	89,470	53,753	35,717	3,131	2,456	675	115,006
Indiana	442	1,127,724	633,100	431,624	45,084	24,541	20,543	770	627	143	66,348
Iowa	984	626,358	445,460	179,898	20,082	16,254	12,828	857	633	174	40,590
Kansas ³	1,500	506,958	365,501	141,457	26,719	14,802	11,917	—	—	—	28,000
Michigan	1,150	1,975,000	1,165,000	810,000	72,782	39,541	33,241	4,000	2,600	1,400	103,175
Minnesota	1,439	808,207	452,353	355,849	34,605	17,248	17,357	450	3,8	72	63,473
Missouri	1,028	961,351	703,635	260,716	37,040	24,668	12,372	977	863	114	51,361
Nebraska	2,516	318,746	194,844	123,902	15,431	8,790	6,641	130	80	50	19,836
North Dakota	603	148,871	97,577	51,294	7,275	4,174	3,101	—	—	—	9,536
Ohio	738	2,270,108	1,395,481	874,627	88,027	49,440	38,587	8,000	5,000	3,000	132,613
South Dakota	2,588	165,635	107,977	57,658	8,420	5,318	3,102	50	50	—	9,398
Wisconsin ⁴	672	859,101	519,693	339,402	38,483	20,457	18,026	369	324	45	58,829
Southeast	1,821	9,717,078	6,071,617	3,642,461	366,286	214,653	151,633	11,816	8,632	3,184	508,573
Alabama	119	831,701	450,327	351,374	29,575	15,597	13,978	1,910	1,320	590	45,424
Arkansas	410	461,231	250,881	200,347	17,200	8,714	8,486	260	161	99	25,261
Florida	67	1,220,581	687,803	532,777	47,450	25,382	22,468	204	72	61,190	—
Georgia ⁵	195	1,055,086	633,179	361,907	37,973	23,791	14,182	232	118	114	51,708
Kentucky	200	665,046	436,509	228,417	26,061	16,203	9,768	1,139	880	259	35,233
Louisiana	67	802,502	505,113	297,479	31,388	18,252	13,136	1,812	1,155	657	39,369
Mississippi	149	584,629	356,111	228,518	20,375	11,288	9,087	853	493	360	26,690
North Carolina ⁶	169	1,181,558	850,985	390,575	44,819	30,959	13,860	1,534	1,213	321	67,520
South Carolina	108	637,990	386,699	251,311	24,116	13,446	10,670	48	21	27	33,192
Tennessee	152	871,998	556,993	305,000	31,200	19,500	11,700	900	775	125	46,511
Virginia	130	986,123	620,103	366,020	39,404	22,666	16,798	1,703	1,418	285	49,438
West Virginia	55	428,543	239,364	188,680	16,265	8,765	7,500	1,149	874	275	26,974

Footnotes at end of table.

\$43 million. Even in the Portland, Maine, area, the cost has been estimated at more than \$20 million.

For the last decade, Federal construction grants have stimulated local abatement and control projects. Municipal response to the grants was immediate and encouraging even at its initial modest and totally inadequate level.

However, because of the grant limits, the resulting activity has barely kept pace with the needs of growing populations and urbanization. The tremendous backlog of needed facilities, now totaling at least \$20 billion, remains unmet. The lifting of ceilings and the stepping up of authorizations, as recommended by the subcommittee, would permit and stimulate the necessary attack on the backlog.

Since the national pollution abatement program began in 1948, the basic legislative policy has been that the control of pollution is a State responsibility. Regrettably, most States have failed to help communities meet the costs of abatement and control. Presently, only six States have authority to apply State funds for this purpose.

Our job, then, is to provide more incentive to the States. A 10 percent Federal bonus for State matching funds, and the opportunity for doubled Federal appropriations for program support will stimulate State participation.

A challenge to our technology is the development of efficient methods of treating combined municipal and industrial effluent. An appropriation of \$125 million over 5 years would foster the depth of research needed to find and demonstrate the answers. In the long run, these answers would save countless dollars and help us achieve the water quality we will need.

Industry, like municipalities, will increasingly feel the financial burden of treatment. In many instances, this burden can adversely affect an industry's growth and prosperity. Many companies already face this problem. It calls for a reevaluation of our policy on financial assistance to industry for treatment works.

Summing up, there are three basic elements in the Federal Government's water pollution control effort: treatment, enforcement, and research.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 gave us the means for developing and establishing meaningful water quality standards.

But if communities do not have the resources to achieve adequate treatment, standards and enforcement will mean little.

And without research to find more efficient methods of treatment, the costs could overwhelm us in the decades ahead.

Our next legislative attack on dirty water should begin where the Water Quality Act left off. The subcommittee's recommendations are guidelines for our work in the months ahead.

I urge my colleagues to read the subcommittee's report.

JOB CORPS GIRLS START TO WORK

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the

Senate an article about a young lady from my State who is a recent graduate of the Los Angeles Women's Job Corps Training Center.

The story was written by Mrs. Elizabeth Shelton, staff writer for the Washington Post. The story is about Juana Marie Waquiu of Jemez Pueblo, N. Mex.

It is of paramount importance that industry scrutinize the graduates of the Job Corps for potential job placement. This point of view is well expressed by W. C. Hobbs, senior vice-president of Consolidated American Services, Inc., and chief executive of its Management and Engineering Services Division. This company was the first to hire male Job Corps graduates and now blazes a new trail by being the first in private industry to hire female graduates of the Job Corps.

Mr. Hobbs feels certain of the abilities of the Job Corps graduates. His quotation is worth repeating:

I feel very strongly that in the Job Corps, industry has a natural young mine of flexibility and a pool of labor. Just because these are poor kids who have dropped out of school doesn't mean they are not good workers. Once industry realizes they have a pool, and can direct the skills and technical training they need, they are going to come to Job Corps and say, "I need so many of this type of skill."

This is an inspiring and impressive story. It should be of interest—of great interest—to all Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Elizabeth Shelton, be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 30, 1965]

JOB CORPS GIRLS START TO WORK (By Elizabeth Shelton)

The first two career girls to come to the Capital with Job Corps diplomas as their credentials are happily at work in the downtown office of a management consultant firm.

Juana Marie Waquiu, a 21-year-old from Jemez Pueblo, N. Mex., arrived here yesterday to double as a PBX switchboard operator and receptionist with the Management and Engineering Services Division of Consolidated American Services, Inc. She was the first graduate of the Los Angeles Women's Job Corps Training Center.

The second graduate, Willye L. Evans, 20, of Oklahoma City, Okla., has been on duty in the same office for a week as a clerk-typist. "It's just like home," Willye says. "Everybody is so friendly."

Both live on Buchanan Street NE, with the family of a member of the MES staff. Neither has had a chance yet to sightsee around the city, but Willye went on a motor trip in Maryland on Sunday and thought it "very nice."

Her mother is a domestic worker in Idabel, Okla. Willye tried working her way through Langston University in Oklahoma but had to leave in her second year because her salary as an assistant to the adviser of the New Homemakers of America was applied only to tuition and left her no money for expenses or to send home.

She plans to go to business college at night with an eventual goal of teaching business subjects. She attended the Metropolitan Junior College in Los Angeles and graduated in 5 months.

Juana, daughter of a carpenter, attended Albuquerque Business College, in New Mexico, for a year, but couldn't find a job in that city. She learned switchboard operation at the Los Angeles Trade Technical College while enrolled at the Los Angeles Job Corps Center.

Back at home are five brothers and two sisters. The older sister is married and the oldest of her brothers helps his father, but the others are still of school age and Juana helps to support them.

The brand new white-collar girls make \$2 an hour at their new jobs. They will receive in-grade promotions and the chance to rise, through training, to new grades.

W. C. Hobbs, senior vice president of Con-Am and executive chief of its MES division, is confident the Job Corps is producing a competent employment pool for industry.

The organization was the first to hire male Job Corps graduates as employees and found their work so satisfactory that two are being given additional pay and responsibilities. The third was assisted to return to high school so he will have a base for higher education.

One of the reasons that Hobbs feels so assured is that the 24-hour-a-day living experience at a Job Corps center gets everything about the enrollee's abilities and habits down on the record.

"This provides a great deal more information than a series of interviews, or even a job trial," he said.

"I feel very strongly that in the Job Corps, industry has a natural young mine of flexibility and a pool of labor," he said. "Just because these are poor kids who have dropped out of school doesn't mean they are not good workers."

"Once industry realizes they have a pool and can direct the skills and technical training they need, they are going to come to Job Corps, and say, 'I need so many of this type of skill.'

"This is one place where the Government is spending money that is an investment. The kids will put money back into the country." 

AMERICAN PEOPLE SUPPORT RESUMPTION OF BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Times there are two items which, on the surface, appear to contradict each other.

On page 16 of the New York Times there is an article headed "Senate Mail Hits War Escalation." According to this article, the mail in most Senate offices is running 2 or 3 to 1 against escalation or a resumption of bombing, and in some Senate offices the ratio is running as high as 100 to 1.

On the other hand, an article on page 1 of the New York Times reported that there is wide national support for the President's decision to resume bombing of North Vietnam. The article, which ran more than 1 page in length, was based on the reports of 10 staff correspondents who interviewed State and local officials, professional and business men, editors, students, and others.

The remarkable discrepancy between the true state of American public opinion and the heavily weighted public opinion estimates gleaned from congressional correspondence can, I believe, be explained in very simple terms.

The great majority of the American public who support the President's policy are unorganized and do not consider it

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1915

number of banks have made such adjustments, and there have been numerous reports of rates on certificates of 5 percent, and, in a few instances, as high as 5½ percent. This has renewed concern that the scramble for deposits might carry the going rate among the large as well as the small banks to the regulatory ceiling, despite the attempts to avoid making this ceiling into a magnet for going rates.

A new rash of savings instruments based on certificates of deposit has developed among many banks. These are being called savings certificates, savings bonds, investment deposits, or other special names and are being offered at rates as high as 5 percent and guaranteed for periods as long as three years. The minimum amounts being accepted are often \$1,000 and, in some cases, as low as \$25. The common denominator for many of these new instruments is the fact that they provide for many depositors a ready alternative to passbook savings on which a maximum 4-percent rate has been retained under regulation Q. There have been reports of unsettling and disruptive shifts of funds among banks, and from savings and loan associations to banks. Whether such shifts are indeed taking place in large amounts is of critical significance to the financial system and of great importance to the economy. The Federal Reserve authorities looked into this matter a few weeks ago and concluded that reports of disruptive shifts were somewhat exaggerated, at least at that time.

But this is not the complete story. Even though a rate war among banks and other financial institutions may not yet have developed, the pressure resulting from the rising demand for credit is tempting some bankers—including a few in the large money market banks—to offer unrealistically generous terms on CDs. There is a clear and present danger that such actions could lead to highly destructive and undesirable competition from which no one—banks, savers, other financial institutions, or the American economy—could gain.

Such a fierce competitive race for savings and time money could be particularly harmful to the small banks of the Nation and the regional and local economies which they serve. Healthy competition among banks and other lenders is highly desirable. However, competition that entices large and disruptive flows of funds from country to city, from small banks to large banks, and from the specialized financial industries into the banking system can be harmful.

I therefore urge the Nation's commercial bankers to exercise the prudence and responsibility that will be absolutely necessary in the days and months ahead. There is no magic formula. Nor will the pressures be uniform throughout the banking system. But it is appropriate that we remind ourselves that the most successful banks, over extended periods of time, have been those banks that have been able to strike a healthy balance between the need for stability and the need for growth.

In reviewing bank policies, several questions should be answered objectively. Does the local demand for credit warrant the competitive quest for deposits? Is the bank attempting to grow just for the sake of growth? Will credit standards have to be lowered to put the expensive money to work at rates that will be profitable? How stable are the deposits? Will these shift quickly with any rate change by competitors? How long will the bank be able to sustain the higher rates?

This we must understand: a significant result of the Federal Reserve action has been to grant new freedom to the banking system. With the prime rate at 4½ percent, banks had become a "bargain basement" for borrowers in relation to prevailing rates in the bond market. The effect was to maintain

an unrealistic prime rate level which gave a subsidy to bank borrowers and threatened to exhaust bank lending capacity. The increase in the discount rate, and related rise in the prime rate, has given banks a new freedom to charge rates on loans that are more in line with the open market.

In a full employment economy, demand for credit can become almost insatiable. The problem for many credit institutions is to control the integrity of their own portfolios through the selection or rejection of the loans offered. Thus the Federal Reserve action on the rate front dramatized the credit situation that had been developing and help to improve our ability to build healthy loan portfolios.

The matter now rests essentially with the bankers in their response to this rapidly changing environment. We cannot expect to be monitored daily by the Federal Reserve Board. We have been told plainly that credit must be restrained. We have been told plainly that banks must not indulge in competitive rate wars for time money.

If the Federal Reserve policy is to be effective, self-discipline on the part of banks is now absolutely required. Any other course of action would be unthinkable simply because the national interest demands it. Failure to exercise voluntary but prudent restraint now can only lead to stricter regulatory controls later.

Indeed, the very manner in which the Federal Reserve has raised the flag of caution is indicative of its confidence in the integrity and responsibility of the American banking system, and this we must honor.

STEPS TOWARD CLEAN WATER

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Water Quality Act of 1965 is a meaningful document. But it does not complete the responsibility of Congress in the critical area of water pollution control and abatement.

The Water Quality Act gave the Nation the basic tools to enhance the quality of our water resources. To put those tools to work, we need the muscle of greatly increased Federal, State, and local money behind them.

The Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution has recently published a report which documents this need. The report is entitled "Steps Toward Clean Water," and is based on 12 days of hearings last year. More than 900 pages of testimony and supporting evidence were recorded.

The findings and recommendations of the report are a sobering evaluation of the problem and the need to solve it.

The subcommittee estimates that the national cost of meeting our treatment plant construction needs by 1972 is at least \$20 billion. The present Federal effort is only \$150 million a year. The subcommittee reports this "is entirely inadequate even to keep pace with the problem."

Furthermore, present restrictions on individual grants gravely limit the program, especially in large communities. While these may be the most obvious deficiencies in our program, they are not the only ones.

For instance, the overwhelming majority of States does not assist communities with matching grants under the sewage treatment construction grant program.

Except in isolated cases, we do not have a coordinated program for handling effluent from industrial and municipal sources in river basins. The increased cost of waste treatment for industries is a threat to their economic vitality.

Finally, present waste treatment systems too frequently are based on concepts developed 40 years ago.

Because of the interrelationship of these needs, no one part can be ignored without jeopardizing our success with the others.

During the coast-to-coast hearings last year, the subcommittee learned firsthand of the nature and scope of these inadequacies. To succeed, the subcommittee has made six recommendations. We should consider them carefully.

First. Do away with the dollar ceiling limits on treatment construction grants, and instead provide a 30-percent grant for each project, regardless of its cost.

Second. Provide a bonus of 10 percent of the Federal grant when the State matches at least 30 percent of the project cost. In addition, cities should be authorized to apply directly for Federal grants when States fail to match the Federal grant. A revolving fund should be established for long-term, low-interest loans to help cities meet local matching requirements when the State fails to match the Federal share.

Third. Authorize \$6 billion for Federal treatment construction grants through fiscal year 1972.

Fourth. Double the authorization for grants to States and interstate agencies for program support to \$10 million a year for 5 years, providing the States increase their share.

Fifth. Authorize \$25 million annually for 5 years for research, development and demonstration of advanced waste treatment and purification methods, and for development and demonstration of new or improved methods for treating compatible municipal and industrial wastes.

Sixth. Provide for collection and publication of information on treatment practices in industrial, manufacturing, and processing establishments. Use the contract authority more extensively in the conduct of research, training and demonstrations. In connection with such authority, start a program of training operators of municipal and industrial or other private treatment plants.

These six recommendations are a bold but necessary program to meet the realities of the water pollution crisis.

By eliminating the dollar ceiling on individual project grants, we could bring meaningful support and encouragement to the Nation's cities. Their problems are at the heart of the national problem.

Presently, the maximum Federal grant to a single project is \$1.2 million and the maximum for a joint project undertaken by two or more communities is \$4.8 million.

For major cities, these amounts are woefully inadequate. New York City alone faces the expenditure of \$780 million for needed facilities.

In Atlanta, the price tag is \$100 million. In Los Angeles, it is \$75 million. In Detroit, it is \$151 million. In Pittsburgh, it is \$32 million. In Houston, it is

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1917

necessary to manifest their support by repeated letters and telegrams addressed to the President and to their Congressmen.

But the relatively small minority who are opposed to the President's policy are highly organized, and the several major organizations which have been playing a leading role in the anti-Vietnam agitation repeatedly remind their followers and correspondents of their duty to write and to wire—not once, but repeatedly—to the President and to Congressmen.

For example, yesterday a constituent sent me a printed card which he had received from the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. The card urged the recipient to wire the President and wire his Senator and Congressman protesting against the resumed bombing of the North—and if he had already done so once, the card urged the recipient to do so again.

I have been advised that similar communications have been sent out by the Students for a Democratic Society, by the National Emergency Committee To End the War in Vietnam and by other organizations involved in the anti-Vietnam agitation.

I would therefore urge my colleagues to take these facts into consideration in evaluating the correspondence they receive on the Vietnam war.

A much surer gage of the state of public opinion than the highly organized correspondence which has been deluging our offices is the repeated public opinion polls demonstrating overwhelming support for the President's policy.

For example, the same New York Times from which I have quoted points out that:

A nationwide poll by Louis Harris before the end of the pause reported that 61 percent favored and 17 percent opposed all-out bombing of every part of North Vietnam if the Communists refused to sit down and talk peace.

Remarkably enough, there was very little difference in opinion on this point between those who had voted the Goldwater ticket in 1964 and those who had voted the Democratic ticket.

Of those who had supported Goldwater, 65 percent favored all-out U.S. bombing if the Communists refused to talk peace, and 14 percent were opposed.

Of those who had voted Democratic, 59 percent supported all-out bombing and only 17 percent were opposed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the following three items:

First. The article, captioned "Senate Mail Hits War Escalation," which appeared on page 16 of the New York Times, today, Thursday, February 3.

Second. The article, captioned "Wide Support Found in Nation for Renewed Vietnam Bombing," which appeared on page 1 of the New York Times for the same date.

Third. The Harris survey, captioned "Public Would Back More Troops, Bombing if Negotiation Move Fails," the full text of which appeared on page 2 of the Washington Post on Monday, January 31.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE MAIL HITS WAR ESCALATION—OPPOSITION LEAD BY MIDWEST AND MOUNTAIN STATES

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—Many Senators reported today that their mail was heavily against escalation of the war in Vietnam.

A sampling of Senate offices indicated that the strongest opposition, as reflected in mail and telegrams, was in the Midwest and Mountain States.

However, Senators from the eastern seaboard reported that their mail also was "substantially" or "predominantly" against escalation.

In the House, most Members interviewed said their mail on Vietnam was light. The reason, they believed, is that constituents are more likely to write their Senators on foreign affairs issues. The Senate alone has the constitutional authority to advise and consent on treaties and has therefore become the dominant legislative body on foreign policy questions.

A White House spokesman said no tabulation was being made on its mail concerning Vietnam.

Most of the Senators interviewed said the mail gave little appearance of being organized.

As might be expected, those Senators who have been critical of the administration's policy for some time or who were among the 15 that wrote to the President last week urging a continuation of the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam reported the largest percentage of mail against escalation.

For example, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the Democratic leader, is receiving mail and telegrams from all over the country that is more than 100 to 1 against escalation.

EDWARD KENNEDY REPORTS

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who signed the letter to the President, said his mail had been 10 to 1 against stepping up the war.

But the office of Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, who did not sign the letter, said he had been receiving 80 to 100 letters a day and that the trend was "substantially" in opposition to escalation.

Several Senators said the heavy mail began during the last 2 weeks of the bombing pause, a large proportion of which urged a continuation of the lull. The Senators said, however, that there had been no decline since the President's decision last Monday to resume bombing.

In fact, some Senators have experienced an increase. Senator EUGENE J. McCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, who made a speech Monday urging the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to undertake a critical review of Vietnam policy, received 450 telegrams yesterday supporting his position and one dissenting phone call.

However, Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, Democrat, of Minnesota, who, unlike Mr. McCARTHY, did not sign the letter to the President or speak out against resumption of the bombing, reported that he was getting about 150 letters and telegrams a week. He said the telegrams were running 6 or 7 to 1 and the letters 2 or 3 to 1 against escalation.

In a private poll taken for the administration in Minnesota just before Christmas and the beginning of the bombing pause, 21 percent of those asked wanted "the United States to go all out for victory in Vietnam even if it means war with the Chinese"; 29 percent believed "the United States should bomb Hanoi and any other targets that will increase U.S. effectiveness," and 27 percent thought "the United States should continue the present policy" of limited bombing.

Only 9 percent thought "the United States should stop bombing North Vietnam, even if it decreases U.S. effectiveness."

POLLS FAVOR BOMBING

A nationwide poll by Louis Harris before the end of the pause reported that 61 percent favored and 17 percent opposed all-out bombing of every part of North Vietnam "if the Communists refused to sit down and talk peace."

The Minnesota and Harris polls would seem to indicate that a large majority of those who do not write letters to their Senators are "hard-liners."

The White House places much more reliance on polls than on mail. Shortly before he ordered the pause, the President was impressed by a poll showing 73 percent of the country in favor of the pause.

WIDE SUPPORT FOUND IN NATION FOR RENEWED VIETNAM BOMBING

A spot check of the New York Times indicates widespread support in the nation for President Johnson's decision to resume the bombing of North Vietnam.

Mixed with this support, however, is fear of a possible nuclear conflict and confusion over U.S. strategy.

Opinion across the nation appeared to be in general agreement, with the exception of the South. There the view that the United States should press the war harder seemed to predominate.

The prevailing national mood was summed up by a Methodist minister in Madison, Wis.

"I think the people as a whole support the resumption of bombing, but with a troubled conscience," he said. "Most of the people feel a loyalty to the Government and support for the elected officials that require them to rely on their judgments. But I feel more people are sicker of war now than at any time in our history."

Ten staff correspondents interviewed state and local officials, professional and business men, editors, students and others on opinion in their communities. The results reflect a broad trend, though they do not purport to be scientific.

Many of those questioned seemed to feel that while the President had all the facts and probably knew what was best, there still was the "nagging possibility," as one Californian put it, "that perhaps, just perhaps, the minority is correct after all."

"It's hard to fit all these different elements together so they make sense," a Michigan university president said. "The loyal citizen has a little sense of distress and uneasiness because it doesn't quite come clear cut."

For some, anxiety over nuclear war has become intense. The wife of a New Mexico scientist called for disengagement in Vietnam no matter what the cost. "I'd rather be Red than dead," she said.

The feeling of militancy in the South was generally attributed to the region's long-standing tradition of military distinction, as well as to the large number of troops stationed there.

But one Mississippian explained it in part as a reaction to frustration over civil rights advances. "They don't see much that they can do to stop civil rights activity," he said, "so this seems to make them want to stop the Communists just that much more."

An indication that some segments of the public may be poorly informed on Vietnam emerged from a recent poll of undergraduates at a college in Pittsburgh. Half of the students, many of whom may soon be drafted, could not answer such basic questions as "who is Ho Chi Minh" and "where is Dienbienphu."

One Texas news dealer found, however, that interest in the war had picked up late-

1918

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 3, 1966

ly. In the last week, he said, he has sold a number of maps of Vietnam.

PACIFIC MOUNTAIN STATES

Perplexity in California

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, February 2.—"Confusion" and "perplexity" are two words that crop up repeatedly in any sounding of public sentiment on the Vietnam situation in this area.

There is no doubt among well placed observers of collective opinion—political leaders, businessmen, professional people, educators, clergymen, editors—about why people are confused.

"It's because they sense that the administration is confused," one said. "President Johnson and Secretary Rusk have kept reiterating the ultimate goal of our Vietnam involvement: to stop communism. No body can challenge that. But there's a vast gap between that goal and the inconclusive military operations we see from day to day. The necessary connection between the two is obscure, questionable. That gap is where people are floundering—along with the administration."

"If President Johnson had said we'll escalate and smash through to victory at whatever cost, it would have been accepted by the average citizen," said Julius Leetham, who as county chairman heads the largest bloc of Republicans in California.

"The fact that there have been apparent misgivings in the Democratic leadership about whether we should be in there at all has pushed the average citizen into intellectual perplexity."

Poll of Students

A recent poll of students at the University of California, Los Angeles, on proper course in Vietnam yielded these responses:

For pursuance of present operations, 2,164.

For "escalation," even into Communist China, 498.

For immediate withdrawal, 553.

For stopping bombing in hopes of peace, 763.

For withdrawal to a "neutral" position, 690.

While most of the respondents in this poll presumably were not of voting age, the shading of sentiment encountered in a canvass of adult opinion leaders suggested that feelings generally in the Pacific Southwest might divide in about the same ratio.

Opinion has not yet generally crystallized into aggressive points of view. But indications are that it would not take many radical developments, either favorable or adverse, to polarize it.

"People are supporting the President on Vietnam—and at this juncture they'd support him if he chose to withdraw," said Philip Kerby, editor of the liberal magazine *Frontier*.

"Opinion is becoming more definite on both sides of the question—mostly, I think, because of the growing intensity of public discussion," commented Leonard Mandel, a shoe manufacturer.

The Surface Facts

The consensus is that the public is well informed about the surface facts of the Vietnam situation, but hazy about the rationale and the administration's approach to it.

"People generally just don't know the reason for our Vietnam involvement," said Dr. Neil Jacoby, dean of the UCLA Business School.

"I think there is understanding that our aim is to prevent the spread of communism," said Dr. Robert G. Neumann, UCLA political science professor. "But things come out, like the Fanfani peace overture that give even the President's strong supporters the feeling that things are not being told."

The persistence of uncertainty about the Nation's course seems to be bringing closer a critical juncture in public opinion.

"It's now become a question of get out or get tougher," commented Conrad Jamison, a vice president of one California's largest banks. "We're doing nothing decisive. If nothing decisive continues to be done, dissatisfaction will grow."

Reflecting this trend, a prominent Beverly Hills dentist, Dr. Fern Petty, the normally jovial former president of Optimists International declared impatiently: "I'm sick and tired of our kissing everybody's foot. We ought to go in there and blast the hell out of Hanoi. We're seeking peace, and that's the quickest way to get it. We're actually impairing our position internationally. People abroad say: 'There's that great big power—and it can't even hold South Vietnam.'"

Heads a Large Temple

More mildly, but no less pointedly, Rabbi Edgar Magnin of the Wilshire Boulevard Temple, one of the world's largest Jewish congregations, commented:

"I get around a lot and I haven't met anybody who liked this venture. Jew, Christian, Chinaman or atheist. I don't think anybody with half a brain wants to be in this thing, because it can't solve anything. If we did win militarily, 6 months later there'd be another government in there. But if it's going to be a war, it should be an all-out war. If it isn't, we ought to get out."

Simon Cassidy, a newspaper publisher and president of the California Democratic Council, a liberal rank-and file party organization, commented:

"The kind of people I talk to—mostly people in the CDC—are disappointed to see the bombing resume. Right now they're willing to take the President's appraisal as long as they don't see a lot of coffins coming back, or it isn't costing too much money, or there isn't any rationing. But as the going gets tougher, people's questions will get tougher. They're going to ask: 'What the hell are we doing over there?—What can be bloodying up some jungle do to defend our freedom?'"

There is little evidence that opinion on Vietnam follows economic or class lines. The dominant considerations, cross-sectional in nature, are such things as the draft and, subtly, the national economy.

Mrs. Robert Neumann, a member of the McCone Commission that investigated the Watts riots, said, "I have gotten a feeling that really disadvantaged people don't think much about international affairs—but that's just an impression. But you do get other divisions of opinion. In my United Nations group, which is principally middle class, there are idealists who believe the war is dreadful and should be stopped immediately—but there are those who think it's necessary."

Resignation in Northwest

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

SAN FRANCISCO, February 2.—Deep-seated regret that bombing of North Vietnam was renewed has gripped the Pacific and bordering States. But the mood of a substantial majority, as suggested by inquiries in a cross-section of opinion leaders, is one of resignation to the belief that perhaps there was no practicable alternative.

Even among the clergy where the bombing renewal was widely deplored, some in high places subscribed to this belief. And some of the "noisy minority" of opponents of bombing, on and off college campuses, acknowledged that they were outnumbered by supporters of President Johnson's action.

Repeatedly, in northern California, the Pacific Northwest, Alaska, and neighboring States, questioners met substantially with this reply:

"I find a lot of people, probably a majority, saying the President and his advisers have the information and we have to trust them to make the decisions."

Coupled with this were similar predictions from a prominent San Francisco businessman and civic leader, a Democrat:

"As surtaxes and other taxes are added to support the war in Vietnam there will be an increasing demand from voters that we pull out. People are selfish; when their own pocketbooks are affected it makes a difference."

A California State senator, also a Democrat, saw a change in mood as already taking place, away from one guided partly by economic status. The country club set, he said, originally demanded, "Go in and knock hell out of them (the North Vietnamese)."

"Now," he said, "as their kids in college are being reclassified, they are beginning to say, 'maybe we ought to try harder to get to the negotiating table.' But what do you do if the other side won't negotiate?"

In Alaska where the general reaction was "the President had no choice," and where Gov. William A. Egan, a Democrat, said "if principles mean anything, then we must follow through," Robert J. McNealy, senate president, a Democrat, thought that President Johnson should "order nuclear bombs dropped on both Hanoi and Peiping."

"By such action," he said, "the lives of many thousands of American boys could be saved and this country entrenched as a world power for peace during the next 50 years."

And illustrating a point widely made that personal involvement often dictates the attitude toward bombing renewal, a Portland newspaper advertising executive commented:

"The idea of using the bomb again is horrible. But I wouldn't be here today if they hadn't used the bomb in Japan." He was in the South Pacific during World War II.

Demonstrations in several States by college students against renewal of the bombing against North Vietnam drew relatively small numbers of participants.

Students Support United States

Jerry Baker, president of his fraternity at Montana State University, reported that his house members were "definitely in favor of the bombing policy."

Gov. Tim Babcock of Montana, a Republican, thought "we may have waited too long."

And the Right Reverend Chandler W. Sterling, Episcopal Bishop of Montana, said that he was saddened by the step but added, "I don't see where we have any alternative at the moment."

There was conflicting opinion on whether voters were well informed on issues. Ross Cunningham, political editor of the Seattle Times, doubted "if the average guy in the street worries about any misinformation."

Joe Frisno, executive news editor of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, said everybody he talked with "has a good idea what is going on and they believe either we should be there or not be there."

Nevadans had mixed reactions on the resumption of bombing and Idahoans, including Gov. Robert E. Smyle, were described by opinion leaders as generally believing that "the Nation was obliged to support the President's decision."

Whereas many felt the public was getting all the information it needed, Governor Smyle, a Republican, called for "a good deal more candor on the part of the administration." And Gov. Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon, a candidate for the Senate, voiced "deep regrets" over the resumption of bombing.

THE MIDDLE WEST

Upper Midwest puzzled

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

CHICAGO, February 2.—Acceptance without enthusiasm is the general attitude toward the Vietnam war in the upper eastern Middle West despite President Johnson's quest for a United Nations peacemaking role.

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1919

The mood seems to be weighted on the side of frustration, puzzlement, and an absence of martial fervor except among some ultraconservatives. The basic reason appears to be that it is difficult to understand how the United States got into the Vietnam war and even more difficult to understand how the United States can get out, an assessment of leading opinion indicated.

Nevertheless, a survey of opinion leaders in Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Indiana found almost universal backing for Mr. Johnson.

"We support him completely in Vietnam," said Ruben Sonderstrom, president of the Illinois Federation of Labor.

The hard core of "get out now" advocates appeared to be a small minority—not even 1 in 10, a South Bend, Ind., editor speculated. But support for the President often seemed forced by absence of any popularly acceptable substitute, or explained with, "I don't know what to think," as in the words of the Springfield, Ill., Chamber of Commerce president.

Mood of Confusion

Charles H. McLaughlin, chairman of the University of Minnesota political science department, said:

"The current mood is one of confusion and frustration. I think people are very uncertain that the Government has worked out a policy that holds any promise of settling the affair. On the other hand, I suppose the majority do feel that we have some obligations in that area and that it would be a mistake to abandon them."

In Milwaukee, Robert Dineen, president of the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., said:

"I think there are quite a few people that are concerned about it but are supporting the President because he does not have any alternative. I am surprised at how many people have misgivings. If there is an increase in casualties the concern will grow."

State and local officials, businessmen, clergymen, editors, civic-minded women, farm leaders, and civil rights workers were interviewed and generally agreed that people were informed on the issue, but often these opinion leaders doubted that the people had all the facts.

Economic stratification appeared to have little influence on the range of opinion, and there was no single overriding chief concern other than fear of a larger war and "how it will affect me and my family."

How Can We Get Out

Said Mrs. William Whiting, president of the Minnesota League of Women Voters:

"I think you have this feeling when you talk with people of not really understanding how we got into this and how we can get out of it."

Opinion, it appears in the Middle West, would harden in favor of a tougher "get it over with" policy if casualties rose and draft calls increased.

At the same time politicians look for anger about "taking our boys." This is not to say, however, that opinion leaders look for a "quit the war" wave.

In Indianapolis, a top Indiana Democrat said that if Johnson "goes sour" politically it will be because of mothers rather than draft card burners.

In Duluth, Minn., the Rev. Frederick Fowler of the First Presbyterian Church, who is chairman of the national right-to-work committee, said that the Republican campaign in 1966 must demand total victory, not stalemate.

Charles B. Schuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said farmers were "strong behind" administration moves to act with determination. But he added:

"Out in the country there is not much enthusiasm for the United Nations. They

think it is quite ineffective and diluted by the African nations."

Gov. Warren P. Knowles of Wisconsin, a Republican said:

"I understand the President's predicament. He's the Commander in Chief and he has the facts at his command. We do not have. I am inclined to rely on his judgment on the resumption of bombing. I only hope we can get out of this mess with our skins. People feel far away from Washington and farther away from Vietnam.

"I think most of the mothers and fathers I have talked to have grave doubts about the conditions in Vietnam. Parents are apprehensive that their sons will be called up. Students are concerned that their educations will be interrupted. There is a general air of real concern on the part of most of the citizens of Wisconsin."

Michigan apprehensive

(By Walter Rugaber)

DETROIT, Feb. 2.—Public figures in Michigan and Ohio feel a vague, nagging apprehension over the American commitment in Vietnam but generally believe that it should be honored, nonetheless.

A series of interviews this week turned up all shades of opinion on the United States involvement. But virtually everyone said that the public lacked information on which to base a really firm view.

The average man, it was agreed, is even more in the dark. "The typical person is more interested in baseball than what's going on in Vietnam." One source said.

Harlan Hatcher, president of the University of Michigan, voiced the frustration of an informed observer. He said he has "tremendous faith" in the administration.

But "it's hard to fit all these different elements together so that they make sense," he complained. "The loyal citizen has a little sense of distress and uneasiness because it doesn't quite come clear-cut."

Most people see "no alternative" to the present course, Dr. Hatcher continued. "A kind of reluctant going along is about where we are. Also, he said, there is a feeling of responsibility "for the men we have ferried out there to fight."

A Hawk Speaks Out

Willis H. Hall, president of the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce, said he takes the "hawk" position on Vietnam and urged the administration to "get in and get it over with."

"It's pretty difficult to carry an olive branch in one hand and a hatchet in the other," Mr. Hall said. "If we pull out, all the Far East is gone."

Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the United Automobile Workers, expressed a different view. The resumption in bombing in North Vietnam was "a mistake" the union leader said.

The President should have attempted to bring about peace negotiations through the United Nations before resuming the attacks, Mr. Mazey suggested.

The officers of both local and State political leaders said there had been a minimum of mail on the war. John M. McElroy, an assistant to Gov. James A. Rhodes, of Ohio, a Republican, said 20 of the men in Vietnam have requested State flags.

An aid to Gov. George Romney of Michigan, a Republican, said that telephoned questions on Vietnam led all others during a mid-December telethon broadcast on a Detroit television station.

There is respect for the war as a political issue, William L. Coleman, the Democratic chairman in Ohio, said that American involvement should "definitely" have a damaging political effect in his State this fall.

A substantial number of the leaders questioned would agree with Zolton A. Ferency, the Democratic State chairman in Michigan and an unannounced candidate for Governor.

"The majority of people that I've talked to support Johnson," Mr. Ferency said. "But they're uneasy about where it might lead us. Their main concern is a worsening of the military situation."

People "aren't sure that they're acquainted enough with the issue," the Democratic leader said. "And they're afraid that talking about it in critical terms might be unpatriotic."

Administration handling of the war is a potential that could hurt the Democrats, Mr. Ferency said. "It's one of those issues that could turn as late as election day."

Support in farm belt

(By Donald Janson)

KANSAS CITY, Mo., February 2.—The Nation's midsection has accepted President Johnson's resumption of bombing in North Vietnam as logical, expected, and proper.

A sampling of views from Dubuque to Denver and Fargo to Wichita makes it clear that the Farm Belt is solidly behind the President's decision.

This does not mean that anybody in the region is happy about United States involvement in Vietnam. The consensus is that the situation is a "mess" that cries out for an "honorable" exit before American casualties mount much further.

The principal basis for support for the President's move is not an overriding desire to halt communism in a remote corner of the world but to save American servicemen ordered to Vietnam and end the entire unwanted involvement.

A feeling that cuts across all economic and political lines is that more aggressive military action is the quickest way to win the war and halt the need of risking more and more American lives.

The mood is to accept any Presidential decision on Vietnam so long as it gives promise of eliminating the "mess."

Few voices are being raised against the President's course, though there are indications that more might have been had the resumption of bombing not been accompanied by efforts to move toward peace through the United Nations.

Should the latest efforts continue to leave American troops mired in a frustrating and unpopular war, the President could find himself with plenty of voter trouble in the Central States.

The electorate has set no deadline, but murmurings indicate that it could be 1968 if the change in the situation most noticeable on the home front by then is simply a mounting toll of American casualties.

Politics Not Stressed

The survey showed considerably more concern about "getting the boys back" than in the political considerations behind the war.

The majority feeling throughout the region seems to be that a much stronger military effort is justified to see whether this will do the job.

If it does not, the mood could change radically in favor of a negotiated settlement.

War front pictures showing injured American soldiers trapped by enemy fire and awaiting helicopter rescue have alarmed Midwesterners already concerned about casualties.

"We are asking our boys to fight with one hand tied behind their backs if we don't bomb the enemy's sources of supply," said Clarence Rupp, of the Kansas Farm Bureau.

His comment was typical. But also typical was his comment that he finds "growing wonderment about just what we are involved in there and why."

MIDDLE ATLANTIC

Little anxiety in area

(By Ben A. Franklin)

PITTSBURGH, February 2.—Evidence of public concern about the course of the war and

1920

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 3, 1966

The resumption of American bombing in Vietnam all but vanished in the Middle Atlantic States this week under a record snowfall.

However, indications that the heavy weather had significantly distracted public attention from the war were scant; there apparently had been little anxiety about the fighting before the weekend storm brought unusual local hardships to the area.

Observers in five States—Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, and Kentucky—said today that there was "more concern about interrupted deliveries of fuel oil for furnaces and of milk for children" than about the resumed deliveries of American bombs on the other side of the world.

The prevailing mood was said to be one of quiet support for the President as the Commander in Chief.

A dearth of public comment about Vietnam—or even of private conversation at office coffee breaks and at home gatherings—was widely interpreted by observers in all five States as constituting "strong but passive support" for President Johnson's decision, announced Monday, to resume the bombing of North Vietnam after a 37-day pause.

They Can Turn It Off

Here in Pittsburgh, one ardent critic of that decision, Richard A. Rieker, managing editor of the Carnegie Review at Carnegie Institute of Technology, described the prevailing attitude of "many if not most" of the scores of persons he said he had talked to in recent days as "about equal to their interest in the Sunday pro football game—they can turn it on or they can turn it off about Vietnam and it is all right because the President who has the facts, is expertly calling the plays whether they pay attention or not."

"I guess you have to call that public support," Mr. Rieker said. "But the war is not touching the country, in my opinion."

"People are saying, 'What do I know about it? What is it to me? The people in Washington have the facts,'" the 38-year-old editor said.

Mr. Rieker is chairman of an informal group here called the Pittsburgh Committee Against the War in Vietnam. He said there were 25 persons at the last meeting in December.

Gov. William W. Scranton, in a monthly televised news conference that was broadcast statewide last Sunday, appeared to have expressed a broadly held consensus about the resumption of bombing by observing, just before the decision was announced in Washington on Monday, that "in the very near future we are going to have to fish or cut bait, as we did in Korea."

"If you can't come to some peaceful solution," the Governor said, "you apparently are going to have to start it (bombing) again in order to stop the North Vietnamese effort from being successful in South Vietnam."

Students Poorly Informed

A poll on Vietnam among 188 undergraduates at Carnegie Tech, published 2 weeks ago in the *Tartan*, the student newspaper, disclosed that half the students queried were unable to answer correctly even one of nine rudimentary questions about the war, such as: "Identify Dienbienphu, Ho Chi Minh, Danang, Diem, and Pleime." Only six of the students correctly identified all nine.

Those who did well on the identifications held "widely divergent opinions" on the war, the *Tartan* reported. "On the other hand, 80 percent of those who knew virtually nothing about Vietnam disagreed with protest demonstrations and supported the Government. Most students fall in this category."

In Kentucky, Wilson W. Wyatt, a former mayor of Louisville, former Federal Housing Administrator and manager of Adlai E. Stevenson's 1952 presidential campaign, during the height of the Korean war, com-

mented that "the Commander in Chief has made a difficult decision and the only thing to do now is to support him fully. But I have not heard any exultation over the bombing."

Mr. Wyatt said that "in the present mood of national uncertainty" about Vietnam, a sharp rise in American casualties and draft call would be received "with a good deal of anguish" and with "the probability of a strong Republican attempt to exploit the issue."

Should the war lead to a direct military confrontation with Communist China, he said, "as much as I would regret such a development there would be total unity in the country to win."

THE SOUTHERN STATES

No critics in Mississippi

(By Gene Floberts)

GREENVILLE, Miss., February 2.—After working hours in Raleigh, N.C., State Treasurer Edwin Gill drops himself into an easy chair in the Sir Walter Hotel, where he lives, and "feels the pulse" of the public as it strides from the hotel entrances to the elevators.

This week, the talk has turned to President Johnson's decision to resume the bombing of North Vietnam, and Mr. Gill is yet to find anyone who criticizes the President for his action.

"The general feeling I get," said Mr. Gill, who at 66 has survived nearly four decades of political activity in the State, "is that he knows a great deal we do not know. We are all trusting him to do what he thinks best."

Across the South, pulse samplers were reading it much the same as Mr. Gill, except for Mississippi and Alabama where there are rumblings that the war should be escalated still further, and at the Atlanta headquarters of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference where the general view is that the Nation should withdraw its troops from Vietnam.

In Birmingham, Ala., more than 80 social, business, and labor organizations have adopted an entire division—the Big Red One—and are peppering the troops and friendly Vietnamese with mail and gifts.

Quietly Accepted

Al Stanton, city editor of the Birmingham News, believes that the city had accepted the President's decision quietly, as one that was inevitable. Had he not taken it, Mr. Stanton said, the criticism would probably have been widespread.

A week ago, before President Johnson announced his decision to resume the bombings, Senator JOHN STENNIS appeared before the legislature and produced rafter-ringing applause by calling for intensified efforts in Vietnam even if this were to lead to full scale Red Chinese involvement. In this event, Senator STENNIS favored stopping the hordes of Red Chinese coolies with every weapon we have.

"One reason the legislators applauded Senator STENNIS' speech was that they do not see much that they can do to stop civil rights activity," said a veteran Mississippi reporter today. "So this seems to make them want to stop the Communists just that much more."

While there is disenchantment with the war among student committee and leadership conference workers, Negroes in general appear to share the prevailing white view. A Little Rock dentist, Dr. Garmar Freeman, said he thought that most Negroes—whether middle class or poor—were not really informed on Vietnam issues, but were supporting the war because "it is something Uncle Sam is doing."

Tendency Toward Suspicion

In Columbia, S.C., Jim McAden, executive director of the South Carolina Textile Manu-

facturers Association, said that although the State "tends to be suspicious of anything Lyndon Johnson does," it is accepting his judgment on Vietnam because it has a "patriotic heritage and will fight over something and is glad to do it."

The general view appears to bear out a recent study of old public opinion polls by Alfred O. Hero, Jr., in a recent book, "The Southerner in World Affairs."

Mr. Hero said that in the period before World War II and in periods of tension with Communist countries since then, Southerners were quicker to give their support to military objectives that were residents of other regions.

They were less likely, too, than residents of other regions to withdraw their support because of increased drafting and taxation.

"To be perfectly frank, the average person is not real informed on the issues," said Barney Weeks, president of the Alabama Labor Council, "but he is for winning the doggone thing."

Bombing is backed

(By Martin Waldron)

HOUSTON, Feb. 2.—President Johnson's decision to resume bombing of North Vietnam has the overwhelming approval of residents of Texas and Oklahoma. But the war itself has much less support.

Opinion leaders in the two States agree that the average citizen believes that bombing of military targets in North Vietnam will bring the war to an end sooner, and this is what they want, but if the war intensifies, residents of both States will give full backing to it.

Both Texas and Oklahoma have strong military traditions and regularly furnish large numbers of volunteers for the armed services.

"The whole Southwest is somewhat militarily oriented," said Charles L. Bennett, managing editor of the Daily Oklahoman in Oklahoma City. "Military service to many people still is the most honorable profession."

Mr. Bennett said that Oklahomans had been showing "a growing impatience at the lull in the bombing" when peace moves by this country were frustrated.

Community leaders in a dozen cities in the two States agreed that the Vietnam war is the most misunderstood war in the Nation's history. Julius Carter, editor of a Houston weekly newspaper, the Forward Times, which says it is the "key to Houston's Negro market," said: "Not only do not the average citizens not understand this war, a lot of Ph. D.'s don't. I don't myself. Most people don't even know where the front is."

Pickets in Houston

A group of students picketed in downtown Houston yesterday in protest of the resumption of bombing. They carried signs outside the Tenneco Building for several hours, and took a lot of verbal abuse from passersby, some of them stopped automobiles to curse them. The pickets said they chose the Tenneco Building because two subsidiaries of the company which owns the building manufacture napalm.

This was the only organized protest against the resumption of bombing in the two States.

The Texas and Oklahoma daily newspapers had generally called for a resumption of bombing, and labeled it afterward as the only choice President Johnson had. Some editorials have said that the United States had not gone far enough. The Daily Oklahoman called for bombing of Hanoi.

In Austin, a leader of the Texas liberal community, Ronnie Dugger, said he frankly did not know what the majority of people in his area thought. "Among those I know, there is a sense of melancholy."

In central Texas, and in the area around El Paso, both of which are centers of retired military personnel, the support of the resumption of bombing is very strong. Where

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1921

Senator JOHN G. TOWER made a speech in Braunfels calling for even more widespread bombing that President Johnson had ordered, he received a standing ovation.

Most of those who were themselves against the resumption of bombing said they did not discuss it with persons outside their own circles.

"I don't know what the people think about the bombing," said the Reverend James McNamee, a Roman Catholic priest in Tulsa. "I know I think we should settle this war, and some people tell me they agree with me. But others tell me they are for intensifying the war."

The editorial page editor of the Tulsa Daily World, Walter Biscup, said, "Everybody I have talked to privately, publicly, officially, unofficially, on and off the record, has been overwhelmingly in favor of the resumption of bombing. It is the only way or shortening the war."

NEW ENGLAND STATES

Grudging response

(By John H. Fenton)

BOSTON, February 2.—President Johnson has stirred firm but grudging response in New England to his decision to resume bombing of North Vietnam.

The support has many facets. Among them are the normal chins-up response to the Commander in Chief and a reflection of integrity in a matter of national commitment. But they also include a growing disillusionment with the entire military operation and a gnawing concern or the possibility of escalation into a general war with Communist China.

One editor in Maine said that he was chiefly concerned with the shaky condition of the Government of South Vietnam.

Those in higher income and educational levels appear to be better informed about developments and aims, though they shared with the out-and-out hawks a confusion over the moral aspects of the situation. One man said, "Just because we don't like the war doesn't mean we aren't concerned about our boys over there fighting."

Those are some of the conclusions of conversations with a representative cross-section of leaders in positions dealing with public opinion in communications, religion and business. And they include inferences made from the disinclination of some persons representing education, religion and business to discuss the situation even off the record.

Little Visual Protest

So far, there has been little visual protest. A thin line of pickets ringed the Federal Building here yesterday. The group was organized by the Committee for Nonviolent Action which is based in Connecticut. But some of the marchers came from local groups that had been opposed to the Vietnam conflict from the outset.

On Boston Common students handing out leaflets to passers-by reported half of those who accepted them kept them or at least put them in the pockets. They said the others tossed them aside.

Jerome Grossman, chairman of the Massachusetts Political Action for Peace, or PAX, said that the picketing gesture was intended to be a 24-hour vigil. He expressed doubt that it was worth the effort and that the energy could have been spent in other ways. Mr. Grossman is a Boston businessman.

[From the Washington Post]

THE HARRIS SURVEY—PUBLIC WOULD BACK MORE TROOPS, BOMBING IF NEGOTIATION MOVE FAILS

(By Louis Harris)

If the efforts of President Johnson and his emissaries fail to get the Communists to the negotiation table in Vietnam, the vast majority of Americans would support an immediate escalation of the war—including all-

out bombings of North Vietnam and increasing U.S. troop commitments to 500,000 men.

The temper of American public opinion might be described as hesitantly but determinedly militant if an acceptable peace cannot be negotiated.

Before the pause, 39 percent of the public said it thought air raids on North Vietnam ought to be intensified. But when asked what their reaction would be if the Communists fail to respond to recent peace overtures, the number who would support all-out bombings rose to 61 percent.

A carefully drawn cross section of the public asked:

"Despite the pause in bombings of North Vietnam and the ceasefire, suppose the Communists refuse to sit down and talk peace. Would you then favor or oppose all-out U.S. bombings of every part of North Vietnam?"

[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
Nationwide	61	17	22
By politics:			
Voted Goldwater in 1964	65	14	21
Voted Johnson in 1964	59	17	24
By region:			
East	58	23	19
Midwest	63	17	20
South	77	2	21
West	48	25	27

The question on increased U.S. troops was put this way: "We now have 250,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam, and about 100 Americans are now being killed here every week. Would you favor our increasing the number of U.S. troops to 500,000—with higher losses of life—if that meant the war might be shortened or would you be against such a big increase in U.S. troops?"

[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
Nationwide	60	25	15
By politics:			
Voted Goldwater in 1964	65	21	14
Voted Johnson in 1964	58	27	15
By region:			
East	55	36	9
Midwest	68	19	13
South	57	21	22
West	60	20	20

Thus a clear majority of the American public is prepared to accept either all-out bombings of North Vietnam or a doubling of U.S. troops in Vietnam or both if there appears to be no other alternative to a Communist takeover. As previously reported, the U.S. public is deeply committed to the search for peace in Vietnam—but not for peace at any price.

IN A DEAD-END STREET

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as the dean of American political columnists, Walter Lippmann, always speaks out of long experience and with the kind of wisdom which has recently, following Senator AIKEN's use of the term here in the Senate, given rise to the characterization "owl" in contrast to the other birds of frequent mention, the hawks and the doves.

In today's column, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, the judicious and well-phrased comment of Mr. Lippmann is turned toward the Tonkin Bay resolution and its use as a "blank check," and toward the vital question of public debate on the questions surrounding our action in Vietnam.

As Mr. Lippmann points out, there are difficulties in holding a debate on this question, since expressions of dissent undoubtedly give comfort to the enemy. But, as he notes, "the remedy for this disadvantage cannot be to silence dissent. For the dissent cannot be silenced."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lippmann column, "In a Dead-End Street," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN A DEAD-END STREET

(By Walter Lippmann)

In saying that under the joint resolution of August 7, 1964, he has full authority from Congress "to take all necessary steps" in Vietnam, the President left himself in the position of a man relying on the letter of the bond, regardless of what it meant at the time it was written. There is no doubt that the language of the resolution gives him a blank check. But there is no doubt also that when the blank check was voted in August 1964, it was voted to a man engaged in a campaign for the Presidency against Senator Goldwater, who was advocating substantially the same military policy that President Johnson is now following. Therefore if laws are to be interpreted in the light of their legislative history, the President is without legal and moral authority to fill in the blank check of August 1964 with whatever he thinks he ought to do in 1966.

It is, of course, impossible to rescind the resolution of August 1964. But as a matter of fact the actions of the administration go far beyond the original meaning of the resolution of 1964. This is the positive reason why the objections and the conduct of the greatly enlarged war should be examined and debated before we are led into a still greater war.

It ought not to be necessary to press this point in a country dedicated to government by due process of law. A President who finds that his powers are challenged by responsible leaders of his own party and of the opposition would not refuse debate. He would not pretend that briefings are a substitute for debate. He would insist upon debate and welcome it. For only by refusing to rely upon the letter of the law would he be acting according to its spirit.

It is wrong to keep using the blank check while many of those who voted for it in 1964 now say—and historically they are indubitably right—that the resolution does not mean what the President is making it mean in 1966. It is also unwise to stretch the letter of the law this way. For the country is deeply and dangerously divided about the war in Vietnam, and in the trying days to come this division will grow deeper if the President rejects the only method by which a free nation can heal such a division—responsible and informed debate.

There are two principal difficulties in holding such a debate. About one of these we hear a great deal, namely, that our adversary will take heart from the speeches and newspaper articles and be confirmed in his view that the United States will not stay the course but will pack up and go home. Undoubtedly the dissent here at home does give comfort to the enemy abroad.

But the remedy for this disadvantage cannot be to silence dissent. For the dissent cannot be silenced. It would be a delusion to suppose that this dissent has its source in the minds of a few Senators and of some publicists. It has its source among a great mass of the American people who simply are not persuaded that the war in Vietnam

is in fact the defense of a vital interest of the United States.

Nations do not fight indefinitely if they are not convinced that their own vital interests are at stake. Although the Korean war began under much better legal and moral auspices than did our entanglement in Vietnam, the American people came to hate the Korean war. The reason for that was that they did not believe that the interests of America in Korea on the Asian mainland were great enough to justify the casualties that were being suffered.

The other principal difficulty in uniting the country behind a national purpose in Indochina is that the President's diplomatic advisers have never defined our national purpose except in the vaguest, most ambiguous generalities about aggression and freedom. The country could be united—in the preponderant mass—on a policy which rested on a limited strategy and on limited political objectives. It cannot be united on a policy of trading American lives for Asian lives on the mainland of Asia in order to make General Ky or his successor the ruler of all of South Vietnam. The division of the country will simply grow worse as the casualties and the costs increase and the attainment of our aims and the end of the fighting continue to elude us.

The revision of our policy in Vietnam—the revision of our strategy and our political purposes and plans—is the indispensable condition of a really united country and of an eventual truce abroad. Gestures, propaganda, public relations, and bombing and more bombing will not work. Without a revision of the policy—of our war aims as stated by Secretary Rusk of our military strategy as approved by Secretary McNamara—the President will find that he is in a dead end street.

WARREN M. BLOOMBERG, MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, organizations throughout the 50 States have named outstanding men for their deeds and dedication during the year 1965, as "Man of the Year."

Assistant Postmaster Warren M. Bloomberg, of Baltimore, received such an award from the Maryland Society of Training Directors at their first annual awards dinner last week. Mr. Bloomberg has not only labored tirelessly to get the mail through, but has also logged many hours to improve labor-management relations in the post office system. His initiation of the impact training program has added a human relations attitude to labor-management discussions.

Mr. Warren M. Bloomberg, a respected Marylander, a responsible public servant, and a resourceful leader is truly a "Man of the Year."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Baltimore News-American be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL ASSISTANT "MAN OF YEAR"
(By Janelee Keidel)

Baltimore Assistant Postmaster Warren M. Bloomberg was named "Man of the Year" at the Maryland Society of Training Directors' first annual awards night last evening at the Stafford Hotel.

Bloomberg was chosen for the award because he most exemplified "outstanding leadership and support of training while not being primarily engaged in the training field," explained MSTD President Lou Clemens before the meeting.

He added that Bloomberg's initiation of the post office's impact training program was the factor most responsible for the assistant postmaster being selected for the honor.

"The impact program," Clemens explained, "is intended to inject a human relations attitude into labor-management discussions and is a landmark in labor-management dealings within the post office system."

Other training awards presented last night went to Dwight P. Jacobus, supervisor of education service to industry, State Department of Education, and to Clyde S. Hartlove, vice president of public relations and employee development, Esskay Quality Meat Co.

Clemens noted that although the MSTD's three-man awards committee was composed of members of industry, two of the three awards were presented to Government employees—one Federal and one State.

If a certain element of pride can be detected there, it's probably pardonable. Clemens himself is a Government man, assistant training officer at the post office here.

Awards committee members were John Fins, of Procter & Gamble Co.; Gustave Semesky, FMC Corp.; and Mrs. Mildred Baxter, of the C. & P. Telephone Co.

Sixty percent of the persons in the Maryland Society of Training Directors represent industry. Clemens said, while 20 percent come from service industries. The remaining 20 percent represent various levels of government.

The post office here will accept applications for garagemen, PFS 1-3, \$1.37 an hour, until February 28.

Residents of Baltimore City, Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Hartford, and Howard Counties are eligible to apply.

Because existing registers for the job will be superseded by results of the new examination, all persons with eligibility on present registers should reapply.

Full information and application forms may be obtained from the Post Office Board, U.S. Civil Service Examiners, Room 601, McCawley Building, 37 Commerce Street, Baltimore 21202 or from first-, second-, and third-class post offices in the counties affected.

THE CHURCHES AND VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful articles that has come to my attention on the Vietnam issue is one written by Dr. Georgia Harkness, entitled "The Churches and Vietnam," which was published in the January 26, 1966, issue of the Christian Century.

Dr. Harkness is one of the Nation's most respected theologians. For many years she has inspired seminary students with her lectures and her probing mind. I had the privilege of studying with her briefly in 1946. At the present time, she is professor emeritus of applied theology at the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, Calif.

I ask unanimous consent to have her article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHURCHES AND VIETNAM—NO MATTER HOW AMBIGUOUS ARE THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE CONFLICT, THE CHRISTIAN GOSPEL MAKES CERTAIN ATTITUDES TOWARD THEM CLEAR

(By Georgia Harkness)

In the face of the escalating war in Vietnam the churches have been conspicuously failing to direct the thinking of their members on the portentous issues involved. At its meeting in December the National Council

of Churches' General Board adopted an admirable policy statement and message, but so far as local congregations are concerned a question uppermost in the minds and hearts of millions of Americans is being bypassed in American Protestantism.

There is no denying the complexity of the situation, a complexity that leaves one uncertain what to say unless he accepts or rejects outright the administration's position. Yet our first obligation as Christians is clear: to maintain our ethical sensitivity to the demands of the Gospel. Obviously, the Gospel gives us no blueprint for the precise forms of action to be taken amid the complexities of the modern world; that is why Christian pacifists and nonpacifists can sincerely differ. Yet we have firm common ground on which to stand in the Gospel's imperatives on love and reconciliation, on respect for human life, and the need to relieve suffering wherever it is found, on the recognition that every person, whatever his race, nation, social status, or political coloration is of infinite worth to God and should be viewed as bound to us by ties of brotherhood. These imperatives have been affirmed again and again by great representative bodies of churchmen. Whether we are pacifists or nonpacifists, supporters of the administration's foreign policy or dissenters we ought to take them seriously.

UNWARRANTED INSENSITIVITY

Yet what is happening to our inner attitudes? The Vietcong are human beings made in God's image like ourselves, perhaps less culturally advanced but as precious in God's sight as any American. When we hear a news report of 240 American boys killed in 1 week, we rightly wince. When we hear in the same report of 2,400 Vietcong killed, are we not inclined to rejoice as if something good had happened? Do we think God rejoices?

Insensitivity to the taking of human life when it is on the other side creeps up on us in every war. We rationalize by saying that thus the end of the war is brought nearer. Perhaps, and perhaps not. In the present conflict the escalation of the war seems to have stiffened Hanoi's opposition to negotiation, as is likely to be the case in any conflict when resources with which to go on fighting remain. Be that as it may, for the Christian to view with composure and even with rejoicing the large-scale death of other human beings is an indication that somewhere along the way our Christian sensitivity has slipped.

Another angle of insensitivity appears in the dulling of our reaction to the slaughter of innocent noncombatants—old men and women, mothers and their babies, terrified villagers who may have been warned but who have no place to go when the napalm begins to fall. It is to the credit of our soldiers that many of them, though trained in the stern realities of war, shrink from such slaughter. If we have let our sensibilities be lulled to sleep, a look at such photographs as those of "the blunt reality of war in Vietnam" in Life's November 26, 1965, issue should help to awaken us.

Though new in form, this is the old question of the legitimacy of obliteration bombing. Those whose memories reach back to World War II may recall that the protest against the wholesale bombing of civilian populations issued by a small group of religious leaders—there were only 28 of us—was generally greeted with opposition and derision. But after the war was over the report of the commission appointed by the Federal Council of Churches on "The Relation of the Church to the War in the Light of the Christian Faith" (often called the Cu-houn Commission) almost unanimously condemned the practice of obliteration bombing. What the judgment of history will be on the conduct of the war in Vietnam remains an open question.

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1911

Because of the swift technical development of communications, Mr. Wilson thinks the world is at the dawn of becoming a single cultural community. He says: "Communications includes important elements of education, and is close to being the essence of humanism; our ability to draw upon the information created by those who went before us is a uniquely human ability. It is in the area of communications that Xerox has its special interests and will make, I trust, special contributions. Communications technology is undergoing a revolution no less great than that experienced by energy."

To respond to the coming changes Mr. Wilson believes that people must receive "purchasing power that is increasingly independent of the hours spent doing things that have represented the great bulk of the world's work up to now. We must, quite simply, invent a new kind of money, a new way of distributing the material wealth of our society. How prepared are we to make the social inventions, the practical non-technical plans, for the changes in our institutions that these developments are forcing upon us?"

It is the tremendous spectrum of change that he sees coming that interests Mr. Wilson so keenly in education. He thinks of the university as the bridge to these new aspects of life, as a cluster of brains on which business, government, scientists, and other individuals must depend for the cohesive intelligence needed to meet the problems confronting the world. The university will help preserve freedom, and Mr. Wilson says of freedom that it may be clumsy but it leads to greatness in any society or nation.

His faith in freedom was an integral part of his work for equal rights for Negroes and other minority groups in Rochester. Xerox today, in association with other leading Rochester institutions (especially Kodak, of which he is a great admirer), is working carefully to open up job opportunities, to give special training, to recruit talented prospects from these groups. The serious disturbances within Rochester's Negro community last year were a "surprise to most of us here for we felt the city had really done a conscientious, enlightened job in this area of our relations with each other. Our difficulties were probably, a symptom of the racial tinderbox here and everywhere."

With his wide reading and frequent travel abroad, Mr. Wilson feels deeply involved with the world around him as well as with Xerox, but he recognized that corporate success powers his ability to render the quality of public service that interests him in education, in racial justice, and the reduction of poverty, and in international relations. Of this aspect of Xerox, he says, "To provide leadership within business for the social projects that interest us here we must be terribly successful. If our business were to falter it would harm our ideas. Xerox's task is to remain incredible, but be credible. We want to be an important major world enterprise. And we want to render services of real value to the world."

In a speech at the United Nations in connection with the controversial television programs Xerox sponsored, Mr. Wilson said, "It is a part of our philosophy that the highest interests of a corporation are involved in the health of the earth's society. How ridiculous it is to build a showroom in New York without simultaneously trying to help build a peaceful world. Our objectives, like yours, are to help men better communicate with each other, and therefore it is all important for Xerox to be favorably known throughout the world as an institution willing to risk in order to improve understanding, which will innovate boldly, but not recklessly, which will accept challenge of its short-range position in order to buttress the long years ahead. It is our deeply

considered judgment, cold and calculated, that this company will benefit by its association with the U.N. and with you * * *. These men of the U.N., of all the earth's people, are living soul-size lives. It is a joy and a value to join with them."

A highly efficient, resourceful, imaginative version of the businessman-citizen Saturday Review regards as essential to the expansion of our economic society and of the quality of life in America, Mr. Wilson is himself living a soul-size life at a time of national urgency when our character and our principles are being challenged as never before.

WILLIAM D. PATTERSON.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON INTERNATIONAL HEALTH AND EDUCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today the President sent to Congress a special message on international health and education.

Reading it, I remembered some informal remarks which President Johnson made last summer at the National Institutes of Health.

The occasion was the signing of the Health Research Facilities Amendments of 1965. Before putting his pen to that historic act the President made a speech which included these words:

I wake up in the morning * * * and the one thing that sustains me is to see what we are doing for the lame and the palsied, what we are doing in adding knowledge in the field of education, what we are doing * * * to make this not just America the beautiful, but the world the beautiful.

He spoke that day of "the goals that we will set for happiness for all of the children not only of our land," but of the world.

I was struck then by the magnitude of the President's hopes.

And I am glad today to see those hopes being translated into a program of mutual cooperation and mutual benefit to the world's nations.

I believe this program will be remembered as a remarkable achievement for the Congress.

It emphasizes cooperation, not charity.

It recognizes that our wealth and manpower are not unlimited.

It gives us an opportunity to broaden the concern we have already demonstrated for better health.

It affirms Disraeli's famous observation:

The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state depend.

I endorse these imaginative proposals. And I submit that if we support them, we will earn the verdict of time that we did the just and right thing at this moment in history.

A large part of the President's message dwelt upon international cooperation in education. The main thrust of the message was clear: increase understanding and we increase the chances for a livable world. Increase our knowledge of the world beyond our shores and increase the knowledge that those in other lands have of us, and we will have taken a giant step toward peace.

VIETNAM — A CHRISTMAS TO REMEMBER

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, while great and difficult decisions are upon the President and the Congress with respect to this Nation's foreign policy in Vietnam, I think it fitting that the observations of a soldier, stationed in that faraway place, be brought to the attention of us all. It is his recollection of Christmas evening in Vietnam, written by Capt. R. E. Ward III, son of Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Ward, Jr., of Spartanburg, S.C.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Spartanburg Journal of Spartanburg, S.C., printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHRISTMAS TO REMEMBER

(NOTE.—Christmas has passed but the memory and experience lingers with most. Here is the story of a soldier in Vietnam in his words:)

R. E. Ward III, son of Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Ward, Jr., of 116 Pineville Road, is a captain with the 1st Infantry Division on combat duty in Vietnam.

Prior to his Vietnam assignment, Captain Ward was aide-de-camp to Brig. Gen. Randolph C. Dickens. For his performance during his service with Brigadier General Dickens, Captain Ward received the Army Commendation Medal.

Since he assumed his duties in Vietnam, Captain Ward and Mrs. Ward, the former Miss Beverly Eledel, have become parents of a son, Robert Edwin Ward IV. He was born on January 6.

From Vietnam, Captain Ward has written his parents about his observance of Christmas. No one can tell his story for him. It follows in his own words:

"A Christmas to remember:

"Christmas Eve 1966, Republic of South Vietnam. Tonight I experienced Christmas as man was intended to. Unlike the typical cold snowy Christmas Eves of my youth, this was a warm tropical evening with a slight breeze, very pleasant and mild. Also different was my dress. On this night I, like most of the other men, was in uniform. Not our dress uniform or class A uniforms, but in the dusty olive drab combat fatigues. Some of the men even carried guns on their hips.

"We all arrived at 2000 hours for the Main Post Chapel Christmas Eve communion service. The tent was without lights due to a generator failure and men were hastily putting up gas lanterns. A wooden floor and strong rough pews had been placed inside. An altar table had been erected with the chaplain's altar set open in readiness for the service. The men of the 1st Infantry Division band (used as guards of the division CP and the commanding general when not playing in the band) were seated inside the tent dressed in starched dress uniform.

"The service began with a Christmas carol played by this great band. We sang hymns and carols of Christmas with one powerful 100-man voice fortified by this band lifting the top of the tent almost off. Never have Christmas carols sounded so proud, yet so humble. So strong and mighty, yet so reverent and in praise of our Lord. Two Army chaplains lead us in prayers, read the Christmas Story, and served the Lord's Supper.

"The chapel was too small for the communion to be served at the altar, so we were asked to come forward one after the other and receive a wafer, dip it in the wine and return to our seats by moving outside the tent. Here were men from all walks of life,

1912

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 3, 1966

all denominations, all ranks and races coming to receive the blessings of their God.

"On this night the fighting edge of the 1st Infantry Division gathered together, infantrymen, artillerymen, engineers, quartermasters, signal, adjutant general, etc., cooks, drivers, clerks, mechanics, gunners, medics, riflemen, all coming to this tent in this strange land to remember and pay their respects to the day that Our Lord and Savior was born. This was the day that God gave His only Son for us and all mankind.

"This was truly a Christmas with Christ as the central theme. It was a celebration of His birthday. After the benediction we went out refreshed and proud to be here in this country doing a job for our God and country. We went back to our tents and fox-holes with a renewed spirit, ready to do our jobs knowing that there is a cause, there is a meaning to our life, there is a reason for being in this land at this time. We knew what Christmas was about and we were happy.

"I wanted to pass this experience on to you all so that you also might remember in years to come that this was a Christmas to remember.

"It was a difficult time for all of us with this separation. And yet our cross is light, our suffering slight in comparison to God who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son so that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. On this day the greatest man who ever lived was born. Let us always take time during this season to remember this event and thank God for His love and understanding.

"ROBERT E. WARD III."

EDUCATION AND LIBBY DAM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one of the serious educational problems in various parts of the country has been construction of adequate school facilities, in time for children to use them, in federally impacted areas.

Lincoln County, Mont., is an impacted area which is due for a much greater impact in the years ahead. Libby Dam in Lincoln County is going into construction, by the Corps of Engineers, this year.

According to a survey furnished me by the corps last year, the school population of the town of Libby will increase by 180 this year, 1,060 next year, and 1,440 in 1968. In other words the school population in 1967 will be about 800 above what it was in 1966, and the Libby schools will have to educate an additional 380 children in 1968. The impact will stay at approximately that high level, the corps estimated, through 1971. The Libby school system now has about 2,000 pupils, thus the new impact will mean an increase of about 70 percent.

There will also be an impact, although a lesser one, on other school systems in Lincoln County, because of construction of Libby Dam.

On January 10 I asked the Corps of Engineers and Office of Education to advise me how plans were progressing on extension of all possible assistance to the Lincoln County school system in connection with Libby Dam construction.

Mr. President, I am amazed by the response that I have received to that request. I find that the Corps of Engineers, which last year forecast a tremendous impact on the Lincoln County school system, has advised the Office of Education as follows:

Most of the work on Libby Dam will be seasonal, due to winter weather conditions. Representatives of the Corps of Engineers have expressed their belief that, for this reason, many of the construction workers will not move their families into the Libby area, and that the workers will live there only during the actual working season. If such proves to be the case, the impact on the Libby school system will not reach the proportions apparently anticipated by the officials of the school district.

That statement above, attributed to the Corps of Engineers, contrasts sharply with the forecast by the Corps of Engineers itself, in its estimates furnished me last year.

Mr. President, I had not been aware of any plan to construct Libby Dam on a seasonal basis. The Bureau of Reclamation constructed Hungry Horse Dam and Yellowtail Dam, in similar latitudes, in record time. Many construction workers, despite the nature of their work and the amount of travel and moving involved, endeavor to take their families with them, particularly when, as in this case, construction will extend over a 6-year period.

Libby Dam's builders are not going to be a bunch of hermits, working when the sun shines. They are going to include a good many family men, many of them from other parts of Montana, who intend to stay with the job, be a part of the community, and educate their children in Lincoln County.

I want to see adequate school facilities for those children. I am not pleased with the conflicting forecasts of school impact provided by the Corps of Engineers. It will be provided an opportunity to review and reconsider these contradictions.

I know that the corps, the Office of Education and the local school system have extremely competent and conscientious persons who want to provide adequately for the children's education. I believe it wise to get this matter of projected school population straightened out as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the corps' March 1965 estimate of school enrollment increase in Libby, my letter of January 10 to Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Chief, Corps of Engineers, which also went to Dr. B. Alden Lillywhite, Assistant Commissioner and Director, Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, Office of Education and Dr. Lillywhite's January 19 reply. I also include the January 28 letter to me from Col. C. C. Holbrook, district engineer—Seattle—of the Corps of Engineers, which concerns not only school matters incident to Libby Dam but also health, highway safety and law enforcement in the project area.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Libby Dam project—Estimated increase in Libby, Mont., school enrollment resulting from construction of Libby Dam project

[Based on an assumed construction start in 1966]

Year	Project created employment					Student enrollment ²				
	Contractor workers	Government workers	Service workers ¹	Total workers	Kinder-garten	Grades 1 to 6	Grades 7 to 9	Grades 10 to 12	Total	
1966.....	200	50	25	275	16	100	40	24	180	
1967.....	1,350	100	145	1,595	95	583	244	138	1,060	
1968.....	1,350	110	195	2,155	130	792	331	187	1,440	
1969.....	1,300	115	190	2,105	126	770	322	182	1,400	
1970.....	1,300	115	190	2,105	126	770	322	182	1,400	
1971.....	1,780	115	190	2,085	125	765	320	180	1,390	
1972.....	1,350	100	145	1,595	95	583	244	138	1,060	
1973.....	250	35	25	310	19	116	48	27	210	
1974.....	30	35	5	70	4	25	10	6	45	
1975.....	20	25	5	50	3	19	8	5	35	

¹ 10 percent of project workers.

² Total enrollment is based on ratio of 1.5 workers per student. Department percent of total is: Kindergarten, 9 percent; grades 1 to 6, 55 percent; grades 7 to 9, 23 percent; grades 10 to 12, 13 percent.

JANUARY 10, 1966.

Lt. Gen. WILLIAM F. CASSIDY,
Chief, Corps of Engineers, Department of the
Army, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL CASSIDY: In the enclosed letter, Superintendent Carl R. Embretson of the Libby, Mont., public schools, shows that close cooperation between the corps, the U.S. Office of Education and local school officials is essential in order to have adequate school facilities available for the thousands of students who will be added to the Lincoln County school rolls after construction of Libby Dam begins.

I am most anxious to see that the Federal Government extends all possible assistance to the Lincoln County school system during this difficult period.

I would like to know what the corps is doing in this regard now, and what else needs to be done.

I am sending a copy of this correspondence, for comment, to Dr. B. Alden Lillywhite, Assistant Commissioner and Director, Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected

Areas, Office of Education. I assume your people are already in touch with the Office of Education.

Very truly yours,

LEE METCALF.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1966.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is in response to the request in letter dated January 10, 1966, to Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Chief, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, for our comments concerning Federal aid for school construction under Public Law 815 for the Libby Public Schools, Libby, Mont.

Our field representative for the area which includes Montana is keeping us currently advised of developments pertaining to the Libby Dam project and with the situation in the Libby School District. His latest re-

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

I have sought an answer from the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture was friendly and cooperative, but not convincing in their interpretation to me. Yesterday during his appearance before the Joint Economic Committee, I sought some explanation from Mr. Charles Schultze, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Schultze is a capable and articulate spokesman for the Bureau which he directs. However, my questions remain unanswered. No real explanation has been offered, no satisfactory reasons have been given.

This program of providing milk to American schoolchildren has earned and deserved to earn, both praise and appreciation from all our people. No charges of waste or inefficiency have been made. There has been not a whisper of mismanagement, not a hint of abuse.

Instead the States want the school milk program, the newspapers laud the school milk program, and most importantly the children of America need the school milk program.

Unless the administration moves immediately to restore the cuts already made in this year's school milk program and rescinds its illogical plan for an 80-percent cut in next year's program, grim alternatives face our schoolchildren and our dedicated State school administrators.

Only children who can be shown to be needy will receive assistance under the new proposal. The meaning of this directive is only too clear. A means test will have to be employed—that affront to a family's dignity. A child will have to swallow his and his family's pride in order to swallow a glass of cold milk. Is this just? Is this right—to subject a child and his parents to a public admission of need in order to receive the vitamins and nutrition his growing body needs?

Or are we to place this heavy burden of selection and decision on the shoulders of the State and local school administrators? This again is obviously unfair.

The fact is that we have a surplus of milk. It makes no sense to me, through a bookkeeping maneuver which will actually mean a loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation, to deprive millions of schoolchildren of the milk they need. Only a small percentage of the schoolchildren can qualify as actually needy, but most families with children in school are likely to be on a strained budget. This is the time in life when the mother cannot work. The children are an economic burden, they cannot earn anything. This is the time when young families most need assistance. This is a program with virtually no waste in it, and I do hope that the administration will reconsider.

The only answer is an immediate restoration of the unfortunate and tragic cuts in the school milk program.

NEW YORK TIMES REPORTS NATURE OF NATIONAL CONCERN WITH VIETNAM

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, the public opinion polls of competent pro-

fessionals such as Gallup, Harris, and others serve a highly useful public function. But they can be deceptive if there is not an attempt to look behind these polls in depth to find out what the answers really mean.

The Vietnam situation is one in which public opinion polls are especially unsatisfactory. Today most Americans stand behind the administration on whatever it wishes to do in Vietnam, for the good and sensible reason that most Americans like and trust the President and recognize that he has far more information than they have, especially in the military and diplomatic aspects of the war.

At the same time an inquiry in depth shows that this support is troubled and concerned. If the President decides we must bomb, most Americans accept that decision, but with the same kind of a troubled heart as the President himself must.

They want us to meet and stop Communist aggression. Yet they want peace. They want us to meet our commitments made in honor as a nation, but they want a stop to the killing as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may have an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

The New York Times has done great national service in trying to probe and develop these reflections in depth about the Vietnam war. This study tells us far more about national attitudes than the bare poll results, which on the surface can be highly deceptive.

I ask unanimous consent that the survey in depth on national attitudes toward the Vietnam war in this morning's New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1966]
WIDE SUPPORT FOUND IN NATION FOR RE-NEWED VIETNAM BOMBING

A spot check by the New York Times indicates widespread support in the Nation for President Johnson's decision to resume the bombing of North Vietnam.

Mixed with this support, however, is fear of a possible nuclear conflict and confusion over U.S. strategy.

Opinion across the Nation appeared to be in general agreement, with the exception of the South. There the view that the United States should press the war harder seemed to predominate.

The prevailing national mood was summed up by a Methodist minister in Madison, Wis.

"I think the people as a whole support the resumption of bombing, but with a troubled conscience," he said. "Most of the people feel a loyalty to the Government and support for the elected officials that require them to rely on their judgments. But I feel more people are sicker of war now than at any time in our history."

Ten staff correspondents interviewed State and local officials, professional and businessmen, editors, students, and others on opinion

in their communities. The results reflect a broad trend, though they do not purport to be scientific.

Many of those questioned seemed to feel that while the President had all the facts and probably knew what was best, there still was the "nagging possibility," as one Californian put it, "that perhaps, just perhaps, the minority is correct after all."

"It's hard to fit all these different elements together so they make sense," a Michigan university president said. "The loyal citizen has a little sense of distress and uneasiness because it doesn't quite come clear cut."

For some, anxiety over nuclear war has become intense. The wife of a New Mexico scientist called for disengagement in Vietnam no matter what the cost. "I'd just rather be Red than dead," she said.

The feeling of militancy in the South was generally attributed to the region's long-standing tradition of military distinction, as well as to the large number of troops stationed there.

But one Mississippian explained it in part as a reaction to frustration over civil rights advances. "They don't see much that they can do to stop civil rights activity," he said, "so this seems to make them want to stop the Communists just that much more."

An indication that some segments of the public may be poorly informed on Vietnam emerged from a recent poll of undergraduates at a college in Pittsburgh. Half of the students, many of whom may soon be drafted, could not answer such basic questions as "Who is Ho Chi Minh?" and "Where is Dienbienphu?"

One Texas newsdealer found, however, that interest in the war had picked up lately. In the last week, he said, he has sold a number of maps of Vietnam.

**PACIFIC MOUNTAIN STATES
Perplexity in California**

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, February 2.—"Confusion" and "perplexity" are two words that crop up repeatedly in any sounding of public sentiment on the Vietnam situation in this area.

There is no doubt among well-placed observers of collective opinion—political leaders, businessmen, professional people, educators, clergymen, editors—about why people are confused.

"It's because they sense that the administration is confused," one said. "President Johnson and Secretary Rusk have kept reiterating the ultimate goal of our Vietnam involvement: to stop communism. Nobody can challenge that. But there's a vast gap between that goal and the inconclusive military operations we see from day to day. The necessary connection between the two is obscure, questionable. That gap is where people are floundering—along with the administration."

"If President Johnson had said we'll escalate and smash through to victory at whatever cost, it would have been accepted by the average citizen," said Julius Leetham, who as county chairman heads the largest bloc of Republicans in California.

"The fact that there have been apparent misgivings in the Democratic leadership about whether we should be in there at all has pushed the average citizen into intellectual perplexity."

Poll of Students

A recent poll of students at the University of California, Los Angeles, on proper course in Vietnam yielded these responses:

For pursuance of present operations, 2,164.

For "escalation," even into Communist China, 498.

For immediate withdrawal, 553.

For stopping bombing in hopes of peace, 763.

For withdrawal to a "neutral" position, 690.

While most of the respondents in this poll presumably were not of voting age, the shading of sentiment encountered in a canvass of adult opinion leaders suggested that feelings generally in the Pacific Southwest might divide in about the same ratio.

Opinion has not yet generally crystallized into aggressive points of view. But indications are that it would not take many radical developments, either favorable or adverse to polarize it.

"People are supporting the President on Vietnam—and at this juncture they'd support him if he chose to withdraw," said Philip Kerby, editor of the liberal magazine *Frontier*.

"Opinion is becoming more definite on both sides of the question—mostly, I think, because of the growing intensity of public discussion," commented Leonard Mandel, a shoe manufacturer.

The Surface Facts

The consensus is that the public is well informed about the surface facts of the Vietnam situation, but hazy about the rationale and the administration's approach to it.

"People generally just don't know the reason for our Vietnam involvement," said Dr. Neil Jacoby, dean of the UCLA Business School.

"I think there is understanding that our aim is to prevent the spread of communism," said Dr. Robert G. Neumann, UCLA political science professor. "But things come out, like the Fanfani peace overture that give even the President's strong supporters the feeling that things are not being told."

The persistence of uncertainty about the Nation's course seems to be bringing closer a critical juncture in public opinion.

"It's now become a question of get out or get tougher," commented Conrad Jamison, a vice president of one of California's largest banks. "We're doing nothing decisive. If nothing decisive continues to be done, dissatisfaction will grow."

Reflecting this trend, a prominent Beverly Hills dentist, Dr. Fern Petty, the normally jovial former president of Optimists International declared impatiently: "I'm sick and tired of our kissing everybody's foot. We ought to go in there and blast the hell out of Hanoi. We're seeking peace, and that's the quickest way to get it. We're actually impairing our position internationally. People abroad say: 'There's that great big power—and it can't even hold South Vietnam.'"

Needs a Large Temple

More mildly, but no less pointedly, Rabbi Edgar Magnin of the Wilshire Boulevard Temple, one of the world's largest Jewish congregations, commented:

"I get around a lot and I haven't met anybody who likes this venture—Jew, Christian, Chinaman, or atheist. I don't think anybody with half a brain wants to be in this thing because it can't solve anything. If we did win militarily, 6 months later there'd be another government in there. But if it's going to be a war, it should be an all-out war. If it isn't, we ought to get out."

Simon Cassidy, a newspaper publisher and president of the California Democratic Council, a liberal rank-and-file party organization, commented:

"The kind of people I talk to—mostly people in the CDC—are disappointed to see the bombing resume. Right now they're willing to take the President's appraisal as long as they don't see a lot of coffins coming back, or it isn't costing too much money, or there isn't any rationing. But as the going gets tougher, people's questions will get tougher. They're going to ask: 'What the hell are we doing over there? What can bloodying up some jungle do to defend our freedom?'

There is little evidence that opinion on Vietnam follows economic or class lines. The

dominant considerations, cross-sectional in nature, are such things as the draft and, subtly, the national economy.

Mrs. Robert Neumann, a member of the McCone Commission that investigated the Watts riots, said, "I have gotten a feeling that really disadvantaged people don't think much about international affairs—but that's just an impression. But you do get other divisions of opinion. In my United Nations group, which is principally middle-class, there are idealists who believe the war is dreadful and should be stopped immediately—but there are those who think it's necessary."

Resignation in Northwest

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

SAN FRANCISCO, February 2.—Deep-seated regret that bombing of North Vietnam was renewed has gripped the Pacific and bordering States. But the mood of a substantial majority, as suggested by inquiries in a cross-section of opinion leaders, is one of resignation to the belief that perhaps there was no practical alternative.

Even among the clergy, where the bombing renewal was widely deplored, some in high places subscribed to this belief. And some of the "noisy minority" of opponents of bombing, on and off college campuses, acknowledged that they were outnumbered by supporters of President Johnson's action.

Repeatedly, in northern California, the Pacific Northwest, Alaska, and neighboring States, questioners met substantially with this reply:

"I find a lot of people, probably a majority, saying the President and his adviser have the information and we have to trust them to make the decisions."

Coupled with this were similar predictions from a prominent San Francisco businessman and civic leader, a Democrat:

"As surtaxes and other taxes are added to support the war in Vietnam there will be an increasing demand from voters that we pull out. People are selfish; when their own pocketbooks are affected it makes a difference."

A California State Senator, also a Democrat, saw a change in mood as already taking place, away from one guided partly by economic status. The country club set, he said, originally demanded, "go in and knock hell out of them [the North Vietnamese]."

"Now," he said, "as their kids in college are being reclassified, they are beginning to say, 'maybe we ought to try harder to get to the negotiating table.' But what do you do if the other side won't negotiate?"

In Alaska, where the general reaction was "the President had no choice," and where Gov. William A. Egan, a Democrat, said "if principles mean anything, then we must follow through," Robert J. McNealy, senate president, a Democrat, thought that President Johnson should "order nuclear bombs dropped on both Hanoi and Peking."

"By such action," he said, "the lives of many thousands of American boys could be saved and this country entrenched as a world power for peace during the next 50 years."

And illustrating a point widely made that personal involvement often dictates the attitude toward bombing renewal, a Portland newspaper advertising executive commented:

"The idea of using the bomb again is horrible. But I wouldn't be here today if they hadn't used the bomb in Japan." He was in the South Pacific during World War II.

Demonstrations in several States by college students against renewal of the bombing against North Vietnam drew relatively small numbers of participants.

Students Support United States

Jerry Baker, president of his fraternity at Montana State University, reported that his house members were "definitely in favor of the bombing policy."

Gov. Tim Babcock of Montana, a Republican, thought "we may have waited too long."

And the Right Reverend Chandler W. Sterling, Episcopal Bishop of Montana, said that he was saddened by the step but added, "I don't see where we have any alternative at the moment."

There was conflicting opinion on whether voters were well informed on issues. Ross Cunningham, political editor of the Seattle Times, doubted "if the average guy in the street worries about any misinformation."

Joe Frisino, executive news editor of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, said everybody he talked with "has a good idea what is going on and they believe either we should be there or not be there."

Nevadans had mixed reactions on the resumption of bombing and Idahoans, including Gov. Robert E. Smylie, were described by opinion leaders as generally believing that "the Nation was obliged to support the President's decision."

Whereas many felt the public was getting all the information it needed Governor Smylie, a Republican, called for "a good deal more candor on the part of the administration." And Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, a candidate for the Senate, voiced "deep regrets" over the resumption of bombing.

THE MIDDLE WEST

Upper Midwest puzzled

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

CHICAGO, February 2.—Acceptance without enthusiasm is the general attitude toward the Vietnam war in the upper eastern Middle West despite President Johnson's quest for a United Nations peacemaking role.

The mood seems to be weighted on the side of frustration, puzzlement and an absence of martial fervor except among some ultra-conservatives. The basic reason appears to be that it is difficult to understand how the United States got into the Vietnam war and even more difficult to understand how the United States can get out, an assessment of leading opinion indicated.

Nevertheless, a survey of opinion leaders in Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Indiana found almost universal backing for Mr. Johnson.

"We support him completely in Vietnam," said Ruben Sonderstrom, president of the Illinois Federation of Labor.

The hard core of "get out now" advocates appeared to be a small minority—not even 1 in 10, a South Bend, Ind., editor speculated. But support for the President often seemed forced by absence of any popularly acceptable substitute, or explained with, "I don't know what to think," as in the words of the Springfield, Ill., Chamber of Commerce president.

Mood of Confusion

Charles H. McLaughlin, chairman of the University of Minnesota Political Science Department said:

"The current mood is one of confusion and frustration. I think people are very uncertain that the Government has worked out a policy that holds any promise of settling the affair. On the other hand, I suppose the majority do feel that we have some obligations in that area and that it would be a mistake to abandon them."

In Milwaukee, Robert Dineen, president of the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., said:

"I think there are quite a few people that are concerned about it but are supporting the President because he does not have any alternative. I am surprised at how many people have misgivings. If there is an increase in casualties, the concern will grow."

State and local officials, businessmen, clergymen, editors, civic minded women, farm leaders, and civil rights workers were interviewed and generally agreed that people were informed on the issue, but often these

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

opinion leaders doubted that the people had all the facts.

Economic stratification appeared to have little influence on the range of opinion, and there was no single overriding chief concern other than fear of a larger war and "how it will affect me and my family."

"How Can We Get Out"

Said Mrs. William Whiting, president of the Minnesota League of Women Voters:

"I think you have this feeling when you talk with people of not really understanding what we got into this and how we can get out of it."

Opinion, it appears in the Middle West, would harden in favor of a tougher "get it over with" policy if casualties rose and draft calls increased.

At the same time politicians look for anger about "taking our boys." This is not to say, however, that opinion leaders look for a "quit the war" wave.

In Indianapolis, a top Indiana Democrat said that if Johnson "goes sour" politically it will be because of mothers rather than draft card burners.

In Duluth, Minn., the Reverend Frederick Fowler of the First Presbyterian Church, who is chairman of the national Right-To-Work Committee, said that the Republican campaign in 1966 must demand total victory, not stalemate.

Charles B. Schuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said farmers were "strong behind" administration moves to act with determination. But he added:

"Out in the country there is not much enthusiasm for the United Nations. They think it is quite ineffective and diluted by the African nations."

Gov. Warren P. Knowles of Wisconsin, a Republican said:

"I understand the President's predicament. He's the Commander in Chief and he has the facts at his command. We do not have. I am inclined to rely on his judgment on the resumption of bombing. I only hope we can get out of this mess with our skins. People feel far away from Washington and farther away from Vietnam.

"I think most of the mothers and fathers I have talked to have grave doubts about the conditions in Vietnam. Parents are apprehensive that their sons will be called up. Students are concerned that their educations will be interrupted. There is a general air of real concern on the part of most of the citizens of Wisconsin."

Michigan apprehensive

(By Walter Rugaber)

DETROIT, February 2.—Public figures in Michigan and Ohio feel a vague, nagging apprehension over the American commitment in Vietnam but generally believe that it should be honored, nonetheless.

A series of interviews this week turned up all shades of opinion on the U.S. involvement. But virtually everyone said that the public lacked information on which to base a really firm view.

The average man, it was agreed, is even more in the dark. "The typical person is more interested in baseball than what's going on in Vietnam," one source said.

Harlan Hatcher, president of the University of Michigan, voiced the frustration of an informed observer. He said he has "tremendous faith" in the administration.

But "it's hard to fit all these different elements together so that they make sense," he complained. "The loyal citizen has a little sense of distress and uneasiness because it doesn't quite come clear-cut."

Most people see "no alternative" to the present course, Dr. Hatcher continued. "A kind of reluctant going along is about where we are." Also, he said, there is a feeling of responsibility "for the men we have ferried out there" to fight.

A Hawk Speaks Out

Willis H. Hall, president of the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce, said he takes the "hawk" position on Vietnam and urged the administration to "get in and get it over with."

"It's pretty difficult to carry an olive branch in one hand and a hatchet in the other," Mr. Hall said. "If we pull out, all the Far East is gone."

Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the United Automobile Workers, expressed a different view. The resumption in bombing in North Vietnam was "a mistake" the union leader said.

The President should have attempted to bring about peace negotiations through the United Nations before resuming the attacks, Mr. Mazey suggested.

The officers of both local and State political leaders said there had been a minimum of mail on the war. John M. McElroy, an assistant to Gov. James A. Rhodes, of Ohio, a Republican, said 20 of the men in Vietnam have requested State flags.

An aid to Gov. George Romney of Michigan, a Republican, said that telephoned questions on Vietnam led all others during a mid-December telethon broadcast on a Detroit television station.

There is respect for the war as a political issue. William L. Coleman, the Democratic chairman in Ohio, said that American involvement should "definitely" have a damaging political effect in his State this fall.

A substantial number of the leaders questioned would agree with Zoltan A. Ferency, the Democratic State chairman in Michigan and an unannounced candidate for Governor.

"The majority of people that I've talked to support Johnson," Mr. Ferency said. "But they're uneasy about where it might lead us. Their main concern is a worsening of the military situation."

People "aren't sure that they're acquainted enough with the issue," the Democratic leader said. "And they're afraid that talking about it in critical terms might be unpatriotic."

Administration handling of the war is a potential that could hurt the Democrats, Mr. Ferency said. "It's one of those issues that could turn as late as election day."

Support in farm belt

(By Donald Janson)

KANSAS CITY, Mo., February 2.—The Nation's midsection has accepted President Johnson's resumption of bombing in North Vietnam as logical, expected, and proper.

A sampling of views from Dubuque to Denver and Fargo to Wichita makes it clear that the farm belt is solidly behind the President's decision.

This does not mean that anybody in the region is happy about U.S. involvement in Vietnam. The consensus is that the situation is a mess that cries out for an honorable exit before American casualties mount much further.

The principal basis for support for the President's move is not an overriding desire to halt communism in a remote corner of the world but to save American servicemen ordered to Vietnam and end the entire unwanted involvement.

A feeling that cuts across all economic and political lines is that more aggressive military action is the quickest way to win the war and halt the need of risking more and more American lives.

The mood is to accept any Presidential decision on Vietnam so long as it gives promise of eliminating the mess.

Few voices are being raised against the President's course, though there are indications that more might have been had the resumption of bombing not been accompanied by efforts to move toward peace through the United Nations.

Should the latest efforts continue to leave American troops mired in a frustrating and

unpopular war, the President could find himself with plenty of voter trouble in the Central States.

The electorate has set no deadline, but murmurings indicate that it could be 1968 if the change in the situation most noticeable on the home front by then is simply a mounting toll of American casualties.

Politics Not Stressed

The survey showed considerably more concern about "getting the boys back" than in the political considerations behind the war.

The majority feeling throughout the region seems to be that a much stronger military effort is justified to see whether this will do the job.

If it does not, the mood could change radically in favor of a negotiated settlement.

Warfront pictures showing injured American soldiers trapped by enemy fire and awaiting helicopter rescue have alarmed Midwesterners already concerned about casualties.

"We are asking our boys to fight with one hand tied behind their backs if we don't bomb the enemy's sources of supply," said Clarence Rupp of the Kansas Farm Bureau.

His comment was typical. But also typical was his comment that he finds "growing wonderment about just what we are involved in there and why."

MIDDLE ATLANTIC**Little anxiety in area**

(By Ben A. Franklin)

PITTSBURGH, February 2.—Evidence of public concern about the course of the war and the resumption of American bombing in Vietnam all but vanished in the Middle Atlantic States this week under a record snowfall.

However, indications that the heavy weather had significantly distracted public attention from the war were scant; there apparently had been little anxiety about the fighting before the weekend storm brought unusual local hardships to the area.

Observers in five States—Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia and Kentucky—said today that there was "more concern about interrupted deliveries of fuel oil for furnaces and of milk for children" than about the resumed deliveries of American bombs on the other side of the world.

The prevailing mood was said to be one of quiet support for the President as the Commander in Chief.

A dearth of public comment about Vietnam—or even of private conversation at office coffee breaks and at home gatherings—was widely interpreted by observers in all five States as constituting "strong but passive support" for President Johnson's decision, announced Monday, to resume the bombing of North Vietnam after a 37-day pause.

They Can Turn It Off

Here in Pittsburgh, one ardent critic of that decision, Richard A. Rieker, managing editor of the Carnegie Review at Carnegie Institute of Technology, described the prevailing attitude of "many if not most" of the scores of persons he said he had talked to in recent days as "about equal to their interest in the Sunday pro football game—they can turn it on or they can turn it off about Vietnam and it is all right because the President, who has the facts, is expertly calling the plays whether they pay attention or not."

"I guess you have to call that public support," Mr. Rieker said. "But the war is not touching the country, in my opinion."

"People are saying, 'What do I know about it? What is it to me? The people in Washington have the facts'" the 38-year-old editor said.

Mr. Rieker is chairman of an informal group here called the Pittsburgh Committee Against the War in Vietnam. He said there were 25 persons at the last meeting in December.

1906

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 3, 1966

Gov. William W. Scranton, in a monthly televised news conference that was broadcast statewide last Sunday, appeared to have expressed a broadly held consensus about the resumption of bombing by observing, just before the decision was announced in Washington on Monday, that "in the very near future we are going to have to fish or cut bait as we did in Korea."

"If you can't come to some peaceful solution," the Governor said, "you apparently are going to have to start it [bombing] again in order to stop the North Vietnamese effort from being successful in South Vietnam."

Students Poorly Informed

A poll on Vietnam among 188 undergraduates at Carnegie Tech, published 2 weeks ago in the *Tartan*, the student newspaper, disclosed that half the students queried were unable to answer correctly even one of nine rudimentary questions about the war, such as "Identify Dienbienphu, Ho Chi Minh, Danang, Diem and Pleime." Only six of the students correctly identified all nine.

Those who did well on the identifications held "widely divergent opinions" on the war, the *Tartan* reported. "On the other hand, 80 percent of those who knew virtually nothing about Vietnam disagreed with protest demonstrations and supported the Government. Most students fall in this category."

In Kentucky, Wilson W. Wyatt, a former mayor of Louisville, former Federal Housing Administrator, and manager of Adlai E. Stevenson's 1952 presidential campaign, during the height of the Korean war, commented that "the Commander in Chief has made a difficult decision and the only thing to do now is to support him fully. But I have not heard any exultation over the bombing."

Mr. Wyatt said that "in the present mood of national uncertainty" about Vietnam, a sharp rise in American casualties and draft call would be received "with a good deal of anguish" and with "the probability of a strong Republican attempt to exploit the issue."

Should the war lead to a direct military confrontation with Communist China, he said, "as much as I would regret such a development there would be total unity in the country to win."

THE SOUTHERN STATES

No critics in Mississippi

(By Gene Roberts)

GREENVILLE, Miss., February 2.—After working hours in Raleigh, N.C., State Treasurer Edwin Gill pllops himself into an easy chair in the Sir Walter Hotel, where he lives, and "feels the pulse" of the public as it strides from the hotel entrances to the elevators.

This week, the talk has turned to President Johnson's decision to resume the bombing of North Vietnam, and Mr. Gill is yet to find anyone who criticizes the President for his action.

"The general feeling I get," said Mr. Gill, who at 66 has survived nearly four decades of political activity in the State, "is that he knows a great deal we do not know. We are all trusting him to do what he thinks best."

Across the South, pulse samplers were reading it much the same as Mr. Gill, except for Mississippi and Alabama where there are rumblings that the war should be escalated still further, and at the headquarters and at the Atlanta headquarters of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference where the general view is that the Nation should withdraw its troops from Vietnam.

In Birmingham, Ala., more than 80 social, business, and labor organizations have adopted an entire division—The Big Red One—and are peppering the troops and friendly Vietnamese with mail and gifts.

Quietly Accepted

Al Stanton, city editor of the Birmingham News, believes that the city had accepted the President's decision quietly, as one that was inevitable. Had he not taken it, Mr. Stanton said, the criticism would probably have been widespread.

A week ago, before President Johnson announced his decision to resume the bombings, Senator JOHN STENNIS appeared before the legislature and produced rafter-ringing applause by calling for intensified efforts in Vietnam even if this were to lead to full-scale Red Chinese involvement. In this event, Senator STENNIS favored stopping the hordes of Red Chinese coolies with every weapon we have.

"One reason the legislators applauded Senator STENNIS' speech was that they do not see much that they can do to stop civil rights activity," said a veteran Mississippi reporter today. "So this seems to make them want to stop the Communists just that much more."

While there is disenchantment with the war among student committee and leadership conference workers, Negroes in general appear to share the prevailing white view. A Little Rock dentist, Dr. Garman Freeman, said he thought that most Negroes—whether middle class or poor—were not greatly informed on Vietnam issues, but were supporting the war because "it is something Uncle Sam is doing."

Tendency Toward Suspicion

In Columbia, S.C., Jim McAden, executive director of the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, said that although the State "tends to be suspicious of anything Lyndon Johnson does," it is accepting his judgment on Vietnam because it has a "patriotic heritage and will fight over something and is glad to do it."

The general view appears to bear out a recent study of old public opinion polls by Alfred O. Hero Jr. in a recent book, "The Southerner in World Affairs."

Mr. Hero said that in the period before World War II and in periods of tension with Communist countries since then, southerners were quicker to give their support to military objectives than were residents of other regions.

They were less likely, too, than residents of other regions to withdraw their support because of increased drafting and taxation.

"To be perfectly frank, the average person is not real informed on the issues," said Barney Weeks, president of the Alabama Labor Council, "but he is for winning the doggone thing."

Bombing is backed

(By Martin Waldron)

HOUSTON, February 2.—President Johnson's decision to resume bombing of North Vietnam has the overwhelming approval of residents of Texas and Oklahoma. But the war itself has much less support.

Opinion leaders in the two States agree that the average citizen believes that bombing of military targets in North Vietnam will bring the war to an end sooner, and this is what they want, but if the war intensifies, residents of both States will give full backing to it.

Both Texas and Oklahoma have strong military traditions, and regularly furnish large numbers of volunteers for the armed services.

"The whole Southwest is somewhat militarily oriented," said Charles L. Bennett, managing editor of The Daily Oklahoman in Oklahoma City. "Military service to many people still is the most honorable profession."

Mr. Bennett said that Oklahomans had been showing "a growing impatience at the lull in the bombing" when peace moves by this country were frustrated.

Community leaders in a dozen cities in the two States agreed that the Vietnam war is the most misunderstood war in the Nation's history. Julius Carter, editor of a Houston weekly newspaper, The Foreard Times, which says it is the "key to Houston's Negro market," said: "Not only do the average citizens not understand this war, a lot of Ph. D.'s don't. I don't myself. Most people don't even know where the front is."

Pickets in Houston

A group of students picketed in downtown Houston yesterday in protest of the resumption of bombing. They carried signs outside the Tenneco building for several hours, and took a lot of verbal abuse from passersby; some of them stopped automobiles to curse them. The pickets said they chose the Tenneco building because two subsidiaries of the company which owns the building manufacture napalm.

This was the only organized protest against the resumption of bombing in the two States.

The Texas and Oklahoma daily newspapers had generally called for a resumption of bombing, and labeled it afterwards as the only choice President Johnson had. Some editorials have said that the United States had not gone far enough. The Daily Oklahoman called for bombing of Hanoi.

In Austin, a leader of the Texas liberal community, Ronnie Dugger, said he frankly did not know what the majority of people in his area thought. "Among those I know, there is a sense of melancholy."

In central Texas, and in the area around El Paso, both of which are centers of retired military personnel, the support of the resumption of bombing is very strong. Where Senator JOHN G. TOWER made a speech in Braumfels calling for even more widespread bombing than President Johnson had ordered, he received a standing ovation.

Most of those who were themselves against the resumption of bombing said they did not discuss it with persons outside their own circles.

"I don't know what the people think about the bombing," said Rev. James McNamee, a Roman Catholic priest in Tulsa. "I know I think we should settle this war, and some people tell me they agree with me. But others tell me they are for intensifying the war."

The editorial page editor of the Tulsa Daily World, Walter Biscup, said, "Everybody I have talked to privately, publicly, officially, unofficially, on and off the record, has been overwhelmingly in favor of the resumption of bombing. It is the only way of shortening the war."

NEW ENGLAND STATES

Grudging response

(By John H. Fenton)

BOSTON, February 2.—President Johnson has stirred firm but grudging response in New England to his decision to resume bombing of North Vietnam.

The support has many facets. Among them are the normal chins-up response to the Commander in Chief and a reflection of integrity in a matter of national commitment. But they also include a growing disillusionment with the entire military operation and a gnawing concern for the possibility of escalation into a general war with Communist China.

One editor in Maine said that he was chiefly concerned with the shaky condition of the Government of South Vietnam.

Those in higher income and educational levels appear to be better informed about developments and aims, though they shared with the out-and-out hawks a confusion over the moral aspects of the situation. One man said, "Just because we don't like the war doesn't mean we aren't concerned about our boys over there fighting."

February 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1907

Those are some of the conclusions of conversations with a representative cross section of leaders in positions dealing with public opinion in communications, religion and business. And they include inferences made from the disinclination of some persons representing education, religion, and business to discuss the situation even off the record.

Little Visual Protest

So far, there has been little visual protest. A thin line of pickets ringed the Federal building here yesterday. The group was organized by the Committee for Nonviolent Action which is based in Connecticut. But some of the marchers came from local groups that had been opposed to the Vietnam conflict from the outset.

On Boston Common, students handing out leaflets to passers-by reported half of those who accepted them kept them or at least put them in the pockets. They said the others tossed them aside.

Jerome Grossman, chairman of the Massachusetts Political Action for Peace, or PAX, said that the picketing gesture was intended to be a 24-hour vigil. He expressed doubt that it was worth the effort and that the energy could have been spent in other ways. Mr. Grossman is a Boston businessman.

L.B.J. ECONOMIC POLICIES PASS WITH COLORS FLYING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is about time that someone gave frank praise to the remarkable record this Government has made in recent years to the remarkable economic expansion and growth of our Government.

Complaints about inflation, excessive spending, and so forth come easily and make headlines. But the biggest economic fact today is the magnificent showing of the American economy and everyone with an eye to see and a brain to think must concede that the policies of the Johnson administration have had a great deal to do with it.

Hearings this week before the Joint Congressional Economic Committee has reinforced these Johnson administration achievements.

In today's Washington Post, Harold Dorsey makes a welcome analysis of the economic report. He shows that the report is not simply a singing of hosannas to the past achievements but a realistic program to meet the problems of prosperity and high employment.

He points out that the President stands ready to recommend unpopular policies if necessary, as the President says:

If the tax measures I am now proposing, in conjunction with the moderating influence of monetary policy, do not hold total demand within the bounds of the Nation's productive capacity, I will not hesitate to ask for further fiscal restraint on private spending.

Dorsey calls that statement by the President "an impressive mouthful of economic wisdom" and the answer to the many economists who "have been doubting that the administration recognizes the problem and who have been skeptical of the President's willingness to adopt corrective policies."

I ask unanimous consent that the article from today's Washington Post by Harold Dorsey, entitled "L.B.J. Economic Report Reassuring" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1966]

INVESTMENT VIEW—L.B.J. ECONOMIC REPORT

REASSURING

(By Harold Dorsey)

The annual economic report which President Johnson submitted to Congress last week should be placed on the "required reading" list of everyone interested in the current position of the economy and its prospects. It contains facts and reasoning which validate the administration's fiscal and monetary policies.

It portrays an adjustment in some of the policies which have been so effective in promoting the excellent growth of the economy in the past several years. Obviously, the shift is not designed to reverse the favorable trends. Quite to the contrary. Policies are being adjusted for the purpose of protecting a sustainable growth trend against inflation pressures which would create serious mal-adjustments.

The President bluntly recognizes the threat of inflation. He states: "If the tax measures I am now proposing, in conjunction with the moderating influence of monetary policy, do not hold total demand within the bounds of the Nation's productive capacity, I will not hesitate to ask for further fiscal restraints on private spending."

That is an impressive mouthful of economic wisdom. Not only does it recognize the condition, but it also expresses a determination to restrain demand to whatever degree is necessary to equate it with supply. The statement seems to me to be the answer to the many economists who have been doubting that the administration recognizes the problem and who have been skeptical of the President's willingness to adopt corrective policies.

Equally important in this quotation is the implication of coordination in the use of monetary policies and fiscal policies. This is reassuring because it has appeared in the past few months that there was friction, rather than coordination, in the relations of the Federal Reserve and the administration.

The economic message explains with unusual clarity the policies which led to the current condition of full utilization of the economy's resources. It explains why the problems and policies of a fully occupied economy are different than those of the last few years. It recognizes that the problems ahead require an adjustment in policies if a satisfactory solution is to be found.

I find it very difficult to criticize the policy adjustments that have been recommended. The acceleration of tax payments is likely to slacken moderately the upward trend in the spending of the private sector, but only temporarily. It is one of the efforts to restrain demand a little while the growth in capacity and supply catches up. Tighter credit and higher interest rates are designed to contribute to the same objective. The temporary restraint on otherwise desirable Government expenditures is a third contribution to the same end. The timing and coordination of all three of the policy decisions is a neat bit of planning.

The President's plea to business and labor leaders for restraint is appropriate. The report tried to explain to them why their individual self interest would be damaged by inflation, which is the most unjust and capricious form of taxation. The administration's approach is one of education, not dictation.

Many economists doubt that the art of economic planning has reached the state where monetary and fiscal policies can be tuned to the fine point that will yield a growth trend in the demand for goods and services that will align with the growth trend of the economy's resources.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO EXTEND THE TERMS OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO 4 YEARS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the proposed constitutional amendment to extend the term of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years makes good sense.

A hundred and seventy years ago, the business of Congress was limited in scope, modest in volume, and less complicated in nature. With the growing complexity of our modern society, the march of technology and the rise of the United States to a position of unparalleled world power, the business of Congress has undergone radical change.

Our work is now almost unlimited in subject matter. Its volume is staggering. Its complexity is such that an entire lifetime could profitably be spent in trying to master it.

There are, in fact, venerable Members who have acquired great expertise through long experience in that body, in one or another field of legislation. Their judgment is profoundly respected. Freshman Members should also have an opportunity to acquire, through experience in office, at least the minimum of knowledge and of skill that is necessary today in order to discharge our collective duties effectively. The present 2-year term practically precludes attainment of that indispensable minimum.

Consider for a moment the workload that confronts the Congress in this second half of the 20th century. We must come to grips with the strategy of nuclear defense, the exploration of outer space, the use of natural resources. We concern ourselves with foreign military economic aid, Federal aid to education, social security, labor relations, highways and housing, industrial health and safety. In every one of these fields, a high degree of expertise is required for the enlightened discharge of the legislative function. That requirement cannot be met in any field—let alone in more than one—within the short space of a 2-year term.

The problem is greatly intensified, moreover, by the hundred-fold increase since 1789 in the number of bills introduced in the House of Representatives during a typical session of Congress. Legislation that is consistently high in quality as well as adequate in quantity to meet this Nation's growing needs would be most likely to emerge from that body if its Members could devote an uninterrupted stretch of 4 years to the problems involved.